

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

45. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to military appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

46. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

47. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to U.S. military superiority over the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

48. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

49. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

50. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to Rhodesian chrome; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

51. Also, petition of the General Staff, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAYCEES HONOR COHEN AS ONE OF NATION'S 10 OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for nearly four decades, the U.S. Jaycees have annually extended special recognition to 10 outstanding young men as examples of the important contributions that young persons can make in today's world.

The criteria the judges have used over the years to select candidates for this honor include extraordinary performance over an extended period of time; selfless devotion to a cause, principle, or duty, or a single act of courage or bold leadership.

The list of men chosen for this recognition—all must be 35 or younger at the time—reads like a "Who's Who" of America's leadership. Last week, at their 39th annual awards convention in Tulsa, Okla., the Jaycees honored the 10 Outstanding Young Men of 1974. I am pleased to report that among the recipients was our distinguished colleague from Maine, Representative WILLIAM S. COHEN.

BILL COHEN was selected for the courageous and outstanding work he performed during a very difficult period last year on the Judiciary Committee. The judges noted of BILL that—

In an era when many Americans have become disillusioned with politics, William S. Cohen's record of integrity, achievement and concerns shows an unusually deep devotion to the process of making the system work.

In the course of accepting this award, BILL offered a number of cogent remarks about the nature of our political system, which I now offer for insertion in the RECORD:

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS

(By Representative WILLIAM S. COHEN)

It is an honor for me to stand before you tonight as one of the recipients of the Jaycees Outstanding Young Men of America. I realize that my participation on the House Judiciary Committee in large part accounts for my presence here tonight. I would like to think that my activities in law and public service before or beyond the impeachment hearings would be deemed worthy of your honor, but as Justice Holmes might say, "We cannot live our dreams and perhaps it is enough if we can give a sample of our best and know in our hearts that it has been nobly done."

Unfortunately, we cannot pick our places

in history—forces beyond our control determine whether we shall occupy a page or a footnote in the annals of time—or, indeed, whether we shall slip through life's hour glass without note or notice except that of our family or a few friends.

An incredible concatenation of events and force of circumstance beyond anticipation placed me in a position to pass judgment upon the highest elected official in the United States. It was a responsibility that I did not seek, but one from which I could not retreat.

There are many lessons to be drawn from that experience known as Watergate—what President Ford called our "long national nightmare."

One lesson would be that our elected officials should never forget that in a democracy, dissent and opposition is not only desirable, it is indispensable. To seek unanimity of thought and action is the hallmark of a fascist state, not a free one. Moreover, there is a lesson for the American people that we must demand and insist upon access to facts and information and not rely upon pious pronouncements from government officials and agencies; that we must insist upon an end to secrecy and demand strict accountability; that we must never again tolerate any public official to wrap himself in the mantle of his office and engage in the sophistry that the destiny of this country is directly dependent upon his future success and survival.

I spoke to a group in Boston recently and someone asked me, "How do we prevent Watergate from happening again." There is no guarantee against the future abuse of power. There is no vestment, no statutory web of regulations that we could weave that could possibly insulate men and women in positions of power from the temptations and subtle assaults against their integrity or public trust. But it is important to recognize that the overconcentration of power in one branch of government, the reduction of public debate and congressional participation in the decisionmaking process, the absence of openness and accountability, insures the inevitability of error and abuse.

And beyond the realm of politics, I believe there are some lessons for each of us.

I recall that when I was campaigning for Congress I spoke at an assembly at a high school in Maine. A young and rather cynical young lady asked me why did my campaign literature mention the fact that I had played basketball. I remember pausing and finally saying, "perhaps it's nothing, but to me it was everything because it was an important part of my life where I learned some immutable principles. That there were rules to be followed, discipline that had to be imposed, referees or judges who would call foul if I violated those rules—but most of all the joy of clean competition, of the struggle, the sweet rewards of victory, the bitter taste and disappointment of defeat, the whole range of experiences that each of us will come to know in a lifetime.

And these lessons have been of great aid to me because I learned that it is important to

win, but it is more important to win without engaging in conduct that shows you are unworthy of winning. That applies in sports, scholastics, politics or life itself.

There are many lessons to be found in Watergate but perhaps they were all expressed by Jeb Magruder, a bright, handsome, ambitious young man on the move who last year was sentenced to serve ten months to four years in a federal penitentiary.

He said in a very emotional statement before the court "Judge, I am sorry. My ambition obscured my judgment. I lost my moral compass—and now I must look into the eyes of my wife and see her pain, the eyes of my children and see their confusion and the faces of my fellowman and see their contempt. But America will survive her Jeb Magruders and her Watergates." And this same statement may be said for Egil Krogh, Gordon Strachan, Richard Kleindienst, Charles Colson and a host of other young men who in the pursuit of some thought to be a lofty goal, lost their moral compasses, forgot that there are rules that must be obeyed, forgot that there were judges, forgot that "winning isn't everything, not if it comes at the cost of engaging in conduct that shows you're unworthy of winning."

Louis Kronenberger wrote over 20 years ago that "the trouble with us in America isn't that the poetry of life has turned to prose, but that it has turned to advertising copy." We failed to heed his words because what we witnessed was the revelation that our true values were nearly subverted by single-minded men whose concern was not with truth but public relations or public reactions or playing in Peoria and we were fed a steady diet of advertising copy and synthetics that nearly corroded our constitution.

If I had to sum up my experience from this extraordinary process, I would turn to the familiar maxim that ideals without technique is a mess; but technique without ideals is a menace.

I must add one final note about Watergate. I know it is popular or fashionable today to be pessimistic, disillusioned or disenchanted with our political system or with our governmental institutions and to point to Watergate as a justification for our negativism or mortification of the soul, but I look upon this experience as revealing something very strong and positive about our country, our people and our principles. We, like the people in any other nation, have the moral deficiencies and the mortal capacity to do wrong. But unlike most other people in many other nations, we have the will and perhaps more importantly, we have the freedom, to do what is right. There is no other country that could undertake to surgically expose the ills and evils which afflict it and then undertake to expurgate those evils in living color before the very eyes of the world.

Ours is the first real republic in the history of the world. Beneath our flag, the people are free, the press is free. Here there are no walls to keep us from leaving if we should choose to do so. No export fees or immigration fees on people. There is no iron curtain

around our borders, no shroud to hide the sight of oppression. No secret police to whisk us off in the night without a full and fair public hearing.

And we should stop and think about it, that one of the greatest signs of our freedom is that when you hear a knock upon the door at 4 o'clock in the morning, you can be pretty sure it is the milkman.

And let me conclude by suggesting that I have adopted as a motto the words that are inscribed on the national archives—all that is past is prologue.

When a lady asked a cab driver what that meant he said, "Lady, you ain't seen nothing yet."

THE ESTIMATED "REAL" DEFICIT IS \$150 TO \$170 BILLION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the idea that unemployment and recession can be corrected by pursuing a policy of increased deficit spending and increased inflation is an illusion which is all too popular among many in the Congress.

Those who advocate such an approach overlook the fact that unemployment and recession are caused by inflation and, as a consequence, can hardly be ameliorated by the same factor.

The economist, Henry Hazlitt, points out that what the advocates of inflation do not realize until it is too late:

Is that market prices and costs are all rising unevenly, discordantly, and even disruptively. Price and cost relationships become increasingly disordered. In an increasing number of industries profit margins are being wiped out, sales are declining, losses are setting in, and huge layoffs are taking place. Unemployment in one line is beginning to force unemployment in others.

All this is the consequence of inflation in its later stages. Mr. Hazlitt notes that—

The irony is that this consequence is systematically misinterpreted. The real trouble, everybody begins to think, is that there is not enough inflation; it must by all means be speeded up.

The current budget, and the additions to it which many in the Congress are considering, will increase our inflation rate dramatically. As a result, the effect of the budget will be to drive up even further into recession and, as one consequence, increase the rate of unemployment.

It is essential that those who advocate such reckless spending understand the real nature of what they are supporting. When the administration speaks of the current budget as containing a deficit of \$84 billion it is speaking only of the current and next fiscal years. Columnist George Will points out that "off-budget" Federal agencies, such as the Export-Import Bank and the Postal Service and others "will dip their large ladles into the capital market to borrow \$13.7 billion this year and more than \$10 billion next year."

Discussing the real deficits which lie ahead, Mr. Will writes that we must:

Add \$24 billion to the Administration's \$87

billion borrowing statistic. But regarding this \$111 billion figure, remember the administration's borrowing statistic rests on the . . . absurd assumption that this liberal Congress is going to cut \$5.9 billion this year and \$17 billion next year from social programs.

The "real" deficit, Mr. Will argues, will be \$150 to \$170 billion. How many Americans really believe that such deficit spending will ease—and not exacerbate—our current difficulties? Hopefully, their number is few. Many, however, are not aware of this reality.

I wish to share with my colleagues the column by George Will which appeared in the Washington Post of February 8, 1975, and insert it into the Record at this time:

ESTIMATED "REAL" DEFICIT: \$150-170 BILLION

(By George F. Will)

"America's wealth is mortgaged. The debt load is excessive. Federal borrowing over the next 18 months could be the ton of bricks that splinters the camel's already sprained back."

Texas congressman George Mahon, lean and leathery as a horsewhip, looks like a cowboy carved from cactus. The crow's-feet around the outer corners of his eyes come not from squinting down a carbine at rustlers, but from squinting at long trails of large numbers in small print.

Mahon's service as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has made him gifted at the arcane art of reading federal budgets, and steeped him in his wisdom: there are three kinds of lies—lies, damned lies, and statistics.

The Ford administration, through its new budget, suggests that the government will need to borrow \$87 billion in the next 18 months. Mahon has squinted at that statistic and declared that it is, well, a statistic. He says that actual borrowing will be between \$150 billion and \$170 billion.

The administration's \$87 billion figure is the sum of projected deficits—\$34.7 and \$51.9 billion—for the current and next (1976) fiscal years. But Mahon notes that "off budget" federal agencies—the Export-Import Bank, the Postal Service, and a host of others—will dip their large ladles into the capital market to borrow \$13.7 billion this year and more than \$10 billion next year.

So add \$24 billion to the administration's \$87 billion borrowing statistic. But regarding this \$111 billion figure, remember that the administration's borrowing statistic rests on the patently absurd assumption that this liberal Congress is going to cut \$5.9 billion this year and \$17 billion next year from social programs, the perpetual expansion of which is the *raison d'être* of liberalism.

So add \$23 billion to the \$111 billion. But federal borrowing can be held to \$134 billion only if Congress accepts Mr. Ford's program for raising as well as cutting some taxes.

Assume, for the foolish fun of it, that Congress cuts taxes no more than Mr. Ford wants. And assume, plausibly, that Congress refuses the tax increases Mr. Ford wants, such as those on natural gas and imported oil.

Then, Mahon says, the deficits will increase by \$4.3 billion this year and \$19 billion next year. Mahon whose wit is as arid as the dust bowl, notes: "The history of recent tax legislation would tend to suggest this possibility."

So add \$23 billion to the \$134 billion. Then to the \$157 billion add a little something—say \$5 billion—to allow for this providential fact: Congress cannot go a full year without inventing a costly new social program.

Digging out from under Mahon's brimstone shower of facts, Rep. Robert Michel of Illinois, the Republican Whip, exclaimed: "Unless we in Congress do something about

it, we're headed toward a first-class disaster." But that is the American way. If you're going, go first-class, even if where you're going is just deeper into debt.

Debt, too, is as American as frozen apple pie garnished with a slice of processed cheese.

Richard Whalen, a private international consultant and one of Washington's most respected economic thinkers, asks: What has been the secret of our remarkable recent prosperity? And Whalen answers himself:

"In a word: debt. Debt so unimaginably large in the private sector and public sectors alike—some \$2.5 trillion, according to the latest count—that the idea of ever paying off any substantial part of it is unthinkable. McGraw-Hill's economists recently totted up the categories: \$1 trillion in corporate debt, \$600 billion in mortgage debt, \$500 billion in U.S. government debt, \$200 billion in state and local government debt, and \$200 billion in consumer debt. Merely to pay the interest due this year, they calculated, would take a sum more than one third the GNP of the next biggest capitalist economy, Japan."

America's wealth is mortgaged. The debt load is excessive. Federal borrowing over the next 18 months could be the ton of bricks that splinters the camel's already sprained back. This borrowing will abort any recovery by sending interest rates soaring, devastating the housing industry, and drying up the pool of long-term investment capital, the muscle-building protein of the American economy.

We have borrowed against the future, and now the future is bearing down on us. Bye, bye, American pie.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENTIALS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, more than half of the 2.8 million civil servants employed by the Federal Government live and work in major metropolitan areas of our country. For too long, they have been paid salaries with little consideration given to the real cost of living in those areas. To establish a more equitable system, I am introducing legislation that would provide a special cost of living pay schedule containing increased pay rates for these 1.6 million Federal employees in areas of half million or more population to offset the extraordinary cost of urban living.

The purpose of this legislation is to equalize Federal employees' income in terms of real dollars, that is, buying power. Since it costs more to support the identical standard of living in a major metropolitan area than it does in a nonmetropolitan community, paycheck comparability cannot be determined by mere quantity of dollars. Rather we must look at the purchasing power of that paycheck. The thrust of this bill is to equalize the real dollar income of Government workers doing the same job in different parts of the country.

Private industry and many State governments already pay higher salaries and wages to employees in large cities than they do for the same kind of work in other areas where living costs are not as high. Private industry has a policy which

takes the cost of living aspect into consideration when establishing pay scales. An employee may transfer to New York City from another part of the country and automatically receive a 10 to 20 percent increase in pay, even though he continues to do the same kind of work. A typist, file clerk, laborer, or white collar employee of a large national corporation in New York City receives a higher salary or wage than his counterpart in the same company in other areas of the country.

Some State governments take similar action. For example, the State of New York pays employees who work in New York City a higher salary than those State workers with comparable jobs in other parts of the State where the cost of living is not so great. In recognition of the higher cost of living in New York City, municipal salaries of the city employees rank among the highest in the country.

We are the Nation with the highest standard of living in the world. Fifty-five percent of the Federal Government's 2.8 million employees live in metropolitan areas of a half-million or more population and yet many of these employees are paid salaries which are less than they could receive if they collected welfare. For example, a Government clerical worker living in New York City—or anywhere else in the country—receives an annual income of \$5,294. By contrast, a New York City welfare recipient receives the equivalent of \$5,736 annually. Every other national employer has resolved this issue.

Evidence of the necessity for this legislation can be found in job actions by Federal employees seeking higher pay, most notably postal workers, who are no longer covered by the Civil Service pay schedules as a result of the Postal Reorganization Act. Actions such as these were centered in the big cities and high cost of living areas.

Elsewhere, workers seem more satisfied with Federal pay scales. In fact, in many rural and suburban areas, Federal salaries are actually higher than State and local government and private industry pay for similar work.

There is some indication, however, that the Federal Government is aware of the problem. Per diem rates for civil servants are larger when they visit certain large cities, in recognition of the higher costs there. In addition, eligibility standards for the school lunch program permit higher income levels in urban industrial centers than in rural nonindustrial areas.

Under current Federal pay scales, a

GS-1 appointee starts at \$5,294; a GS-2 appointments pay \$5,996; a GS-3 salary is \$6,764. By comparison, a family of four on welfare in New York City, as noted above, receives the equivalent of \$5,736 a year.

The employees classified in the higher grades who do receive more in salary than they would on welfare still, in most cases receive less than the income requirements for a family of four to maintain a modest standard of living.

Studies by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics show the typical family of four needs \$7,626 to maintain a lower budget level in a small city, but about \$1,000 more for the same standard of living in New York City, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston, Honolulu, or Seattle.

The starting salary for a GS-1 appointment, which is a clerical job, is \$5,294—some \$2,000 below BLS's lower budget level for smaller cities and \$3,000 below the level for large metropolitan areas.

In fact, even a GS-5, who must have 4 years of college or equivalent experience, would not reach the minimum budget for most large cities. His starting pay is \$8,500. That, however, is above the small city requirement.

This same relative disadvantage for big city workers holds true across-the-board.

The mid-level civil servant, the GS-9, needs a master's degree, a law degree or comparable experience. Starting pay is \$12,841. That is several hundred dollars below the intermediate budget level for the average large city and even further below what is needed in New York, Washington, D.C., Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. But, it is more than \$1,500 over and above the small city requirements.

To maintain a higher budget level, the family of four would need \$15,708 in a city of 50,000 or fewer, but in a metropolitan area like New York City that figure is \$22,000. However, a senior level civil servant, GS-13, starts at \$21,816. As you can see, that is more than enough to live very comfortably in a small city, but it is still inadequate in large metropolitan areas.

The figures and the charts I am inserting following these remarks clearly show the disadvantage our current civil service pay system puts on the 1.6 million Government employees who live and work in the Nation's large cities.

As we have seen, public assistance in

some places pays more than public employment.

Increased salaries through regional differentials would not only be more equitable to Federal employees, but would be of great benefit to the Government as well. If the Federal Government paid its classified workers salaries which are competitive with private industry in that locale, it would be able to recruit and retain more qualified and better trained employees instead of losing them to private industry. Government service should not be viewed as a training ground for more lucrative jobs in the private sector; it should be considered as a career occupation.

Under my legislation, the Civil Service Commission would establish a special cost of living pay schedule for employees and positions located in metropolitan areas with a population of 500,000 or more. More than half of all Federal employees would be affected by this measure.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been endorsed by the American Federation of Government Employees, one of the major unions representing Federal workers; by the AFL-CIO through its New York City Labor Council; and by the National Federation of Federal Employees.

I include the following:

FAMILY OF 4, BUDGET REQUIREMENTS¹

	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
All U.S. cities.....	\$8,181	\$12,626	\$18,201
Cities 2,500 to 50,000.....	7,626	11,363	15,708
Cities 50,000 and up.....	8,305	12,909	18,760
	GS-1	GS-9	GS-13
Starting Federal pay.....	5,294	12,841	21,816

¹ Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

² GS-3 is starting pay for clerical workers with no experience.

³ GS-9 is a middle-level managerial position that requires a master's degree or equivalent experience.

⁴ GS-11 is a senior level Government worker.

NEW YORK CITY²

	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Family of 4 budget level.....	\$8,661	\$14,448	\$21,999
	GS-1	GS-9	GS-13
Starting Federal pay.....	5,294	12,841	21,816
Welfare family of 4.....	5,736		

¹ Metropolitan area population: 9,944,000, Federal workers 106,329.

² Mayor's office. This figure represents the cash equivalent of the annual welfare payment.

12 MAJOR CONCENTRATIONS OF FEDERAL WORKERS

Metropolitan area	Federal workers	Population	Consumer price index ¹	Family of 4 budget ²		
				Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Washington, D.C.....	316,017	2,999,000	156.1	8,547	13,043	18,869
New York City.....	106,329	9,944,000	161.7	8,661	14,448	21,999
Philadelphia.....	76,735	4,878,000	159.2	8,415	13,022	18,851
Chicago.....	71,477	7,085,000	153.2	8,635	13,213	18,919
San Francisco.....	69,417	3,132,000	152.1	8,939	13,378	19,316
Los Angeles.....	65,867	7,000,000	150.0	8,525	12,520	18,489
Boston.....	36,903	3,417,000	153.0	8,988	14,893	21,986
St. Louis.....	35,432	2,400,000	148.6	8,056	12,390	17,691
Detroit.....	29,958	4,489,000	156.2	8,246	12,810	18,591
Honolulu.....	24,940	660,000	148.2	9,924	14,937	21,901
Pittsburgh.....	19,208	2,396,000	152.3	8,002	12,299	17,703
Seattle.....	17,131	1,400,000	147.9	8,407	12,667	17,924

¹ December 1974 figures unless otherwise noted.

² Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

³ November 1974.

⁴ October 1974.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN METRO AREAS OF 500,000 AND MORE

Metropolitan	Federal workers	Population
Akron, Ohio	2,562	682,000
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.	9,510	793,000
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	2,154	608,000
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.	8,518	1,527,000
Atlanta, Ga.	30,376	1,684,000
Baltimore, Md.	54,571	2,125,000
Birmingham, Ala.	8,499	779,000
Boston, Mass.	36,903	3,417,000
Buffalo, N.Y.	10,145	1,353,000
Chicago, Ill.	71,477	7,085,000
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.	13,683	1,391,000
Cleveland, Ohio	20,861	2,046,000
Columbus, Ohio	12,144	1,058,000
Dallas-Fort Worth, Tex.	27,265	2,446,000
Dayton, Ohio	25,090	857,000
Denver, Colo.	28,792	1,320,000
Detroit, Mich.	29,958	4,489,000
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	3,178	685,000
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.	1,958	644,000
Grand Rapids, Mich.	2,326	549,000
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, N.C.	4,140	745,000
Hartford, Conn.	6,017	834,000
Honolulu, Hawaii	24,940	680,000
Houston, Tex.	18,742	2,124,000
Indianapolis, Ind.	16,906	1,128,000
Jacksonville, Fla.	11,243	636,000
Jersey City, N.J.	8,606	611,000
Kansas City, Mo.-Kansas	22,727	1,304,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	65,867	7,000,000
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	10,373	888,000
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.	14,852	848,000
Miami, Fla.	13,301	1,331,000
Milwaukee, Wis.	8,335	1,423,000
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	18,318	1,996,000
Nashville, Tenn.	7,496	716,000
New Orleans, La.	12,873	1,077,000
New York, N.Y.	106,329	9,844,000
Newark, N.J.	23,790	2,082,000
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	31,948	729,000
Oklahoma City, Okla.	31,829	736,000
Omaha, Neb.-Iowa	8,084	569,000
Patterson-Cliff-Pasadena, N.J.	1,930	464,000
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	76,735	4,878,000
Phoenix, Ariz.	11,003	1,053,000
Pittsburgh, Pa.	19,208	2,396,000
Portland, Ore.-Wash.	14,874	1,036,000
Providence-Warwick, R.I.-Mass.	8,934	783,000
Richmond, Va.	9,560	553,000
Rochester, N.Y.	5,567	969,000
Sacramento, Calif.	26,533	851,000
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	35,432	2,400,000
Salt Lake City, Utah	33,585	744,000
San Antonio, Tex.	38,588	937,000
San Bernardino-River-Ontario, Calif.	12,652	1,179,000
San Diego, Calif.	33,213	1,443,000
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	69,417	3,132,000
San Jose, Calif.	9,579	1,127,000
Seattle-Everett, Wash.	17,131	1,400,000
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Conn.	4,244	591,000
Syracuse, N.Y.	4,920	643,000
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	9,778	1,189,000
Toledo, Ohio-Mich.	3,348	781,000
Washington, D.C.	316,017	2,999,000
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	2,150	544,000
Total	1,631,084	

¹ This figure represents 55.2 percent of 2,864,987 total Federal employees listed by the Civil Service Commission as of November 1974.

LEE HAMILTON'S RECENT WASHINGTON REPORTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my recent Washington Reports discussing President Ford's state of the Union address:

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first of two reports on the State of the Union Address.

After listening to several State of the Union Addresses, I never thought I would hear a President say, "The State of the Union is not good," but that is the way President

Ford began his message to the Congress and the nation for 1975.

It was a straightforward talk, refreshing in its honesty, about realistic problems and goals. President Ford had bad news, he reported it, and he expressed the widely shared confidence that the state of the union, while bad, would get better.

The President proposed a number of steps to overcome our economic problems:

A 12% individual income tax rebate up to a \$1,000 limit with cash payments to those who pay no taxes on low income;

Reduced personal income tax rates for 1975 and afterward;

An increase in the investment tax credit against business income taxes;

A corporate income tax reduction from 48% to 42%;

A one year hold on all new federal spending programs; and

A 5% ceiling on social security and federal pay increases in 1975.

Apart from the vast economic stakes involved, President Ford has gambled his political future on the success of his program.

It is obvious that he has undergone a remarkable turnaround in the direction of his economic policy. Instead of asking for a surtax and urging citizens to be prudent budget cutters and tight-fisted consumers, he now encourages them to get out there and spend, armed with rebated tax dollars.

The President should be credited, not criticized, for the courage to change his policy, but his proposals lead to several questions:

Is the tax cut large enough to stop the recession and to help assure economic recovery later this year? It is obvious that the President's most urgent priority is to prevent the recession, already the worst drop in industrial production in this country since WWII, from becoming a depression. The President's figure of a net \$16 billion tax reduction and stimulus is close to the middle of the \$10 to \$20 billion cut advocated by most non-governmental economists, but he proposes record peacetime budget deficits for this and next year that would run the red ink total to about \$80 billion.

Those massive deficits raise several questions: Are they too big for the economy to bear? Some officials fear that they will generate a new round of inflation, and that financing them will cause serious problems in the nation's capital markets. Other officials agree that deficits in a recession are not inflationary because they restore jobs and purchasing power. The President is trying to reverse not just a year long recession, but he is trying to stop the forces of recession already seriously underway in other parts of the world.

Another question is whether the new spending power is being pumped into the economy at the right time. The mechanism used to put the money back into the economy is vital. The President suggests a device we have not used before—the rebate. No one can be sure just what the impact of the rebate device will be on consumer spending, but economists generally take the view that the quicker the stimulus, the better it will be.

The rebate would come in a double dose, in May and in September, to insure against the recession hitting bottom in the spring or summer, but there will not be a quick recovery. Also, making the payment in two bites means that the Treasury will not have to go into the money markets to borrow a huge \$12 billion sum in a very short period of time, as would be the case if the whole amount were paid in May.

What the Congress will do with the President's economic program is another major question. It is reasonably clear that the Congress will enact, and the President will approve, a sizeable tax cut. Influential Senators

and House members have been critical of many of the President's proposals to invigorate the economy, but there is broad agreement that the nation does need a tax reduction at this time. The program put forward by the House Democrats does not directly conflict with the President's economic programs, although the Democrats were not sufficiently precise to make exact comparisons.

Because of the need for stimulus now, it is probably more important to get some kind of tax cut through the Congress, than any particular kind of cut, although there is much agreement that the reductions should be weighted in favor of low income groups.

The key question, however, is not the soundness of the President's economics. It is whether his policy will generate a renewal of confidence in the government and in the economy which will make the average American spend, rather than save.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY PROGRAM

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the second of two reports on the State of the Union Address.

There is no shortage of oil. Oil is readily available from foreign countries—but at arbitrarily high prices, which is causing a massive outflow of dollars to the oil producing countries and a risk of increasing our vulnerability to severe economic disruption if another oil embargo should be imposed.

To discourage consumption and encourage production of oil, the President has proposed a number of different steps:

a \$3 per barrel fee on imported oil, (which the President has already ordered);

a backup oil import control program to limit oil imports, if necessary;

a \$2 per barrel tax on domestic crude oil, with an equivalent levy for natural gas;

a windfall profits tax on the profits of domestic oil producers;

the decontrol of domestic oil and gas prices;

deferred clean air standards for power plant and automobile emissions;

expanded leasing of oil and gas tracts on the outer continental shelf and leasing of coal on public lands;

the commercial sale of oil from naval reserves;

measures to aid electric utilities, eg. investment tax credits and state utility commission reform;

expedited nuclear power plant siting and licensing;

automobile, building, and home appliance energy conservation measures; and

energy emergency preparedness programs.

The basic approach of the President's proposal is to force prices up in the hope of holding consumption down. Everyone agrees that a reduction in the level of oil imports is essential in order to maintain a steady and healthy growth in the economy. The President wants to cut back 1 million barrels a day from what the U.S. would otherwise import in the next twelve months and two million from what it would import by the beginning of 1978. The merit of his proposal is that it is at last and at least a comprehensive package that ends more than a year of backing and filling by both the President and the Congress.

There is much disagreement within the Congress about the President's energy proposals. There is agreement that his proposals will be inflationary, but little agreement as to how inflationary. The President's advisors have estimated a 2% increase in the cost of living because of the President's energy proposals alone, and others have suggested a 4% addition. There is disagreement about the impact of the President's energy proposals on the standard of living Americans; whether, for example, the proposed tax reductions to stimulate the economy will balance off the average increases in energy costs which consumers must pay. Estimates of the net outflow of funds from the economy due

to higher energy costs vary from \$3 billion to \$25 billion.

There is also disagreement as to whether or not these increases will in fact reduce consumption. Most knowledgeable oil observers suggest that President Ford's plan would reduce U.S. consumption, but not nearly as much as the President predicts. Relying on high prices to cut demand is a very uncertain science. If the past 15 months are any guideline, another 10 cents at the gas pump will do no more than keep gasoline consumption from rising.

And there are differences of view on the amount of reduction in imports which is immediately necessary. Many argue that the state of the economy has to take absolute priority over the issues of conserving and paying for energy, and that it is crucial not to start new policies that will interfere with the recovery of the economy.

These disagreements assure that there will be tough resistance to the President's energy proposals, more than the resistance to his economic proposals. A resolution of the conflict over the proposals is not yet in sight. In view of the differences, Congress is seeking additional time to address the President's energy proposals in an informed and responsible way.

The beginning point in understanding the energy debate, which is now well underway, is that policymakers have no good choice. Any choice that is made is going to impose some unpleasant costs at an unfortunate time. The final solutions to our energy dilemma will not come soon, and for the present, our energy policies must be limited to minimizing the inevitable cost, reducing the dislocations, and choosing the least objectionable alternative. Hopefully, the President and the Congress can develop a mutually agreeable energy policy and obtain the maximum support of the American people.

JACK MARTIN

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly sad when a man of great inner strength, quiet dignity and courage, and dedication passes from this life into the next. It is sad because those of us who are left now have a void which can never adequately be filled.

It is, of course, a credit to a life that those left would feel this way about a person, but such a loss is nevertheless irreparable.

Such a person which I and others from San Antonio and Texas feel this way about is Jack Martin, who died at his home in San Antonio on February 24, after suffering a heart attack several weeks ago. He was 67 years of age.

He was optimistic and alert until the end. I talked with him just a few hours before he died. When I returned to Washington I learned that he was gone.

Jack Martin was a labor leader—of which the labor movement could be justly proud. At the time of his death he was a general organizer for the Iron Workers International Association.

Prior to the position, he served as president and business manager of San Antonio Iron Workers Union 66. He also served as president of the San Antonio

Building and Construction Trades Council.

He was active with the March of Dimes and served on the boards of Goodwill Industries and of HemisFair 1968—the world's fair which I was instrumental in bringing to San Antonio.

A veteran, he was also a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The late President Lyndon B. Johnson once sent Jack Martin as his emissary at the dedication of a dam in Pakistan.

He was a good man to represent a President, and I was proud to count him as a friend.

He will be sorely missed by his friends and community, as well as by his wife, Alma; his sons, James and Robert; daughter, Mrs. Joan M. Sall, and seven grandchildren.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF JAMES M. STUART

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute one of the outstanding corporate citizens of Ohio, Mr. James M. Stuart, who recently announced his retirement from active civic life.

The life of James M. Stuart is indicative and representative of the accomplishments that can be achieved by industrious and dedicated individuals. Beginning his career at the lowest rung of the Dayton Power and Light Co. in March 1923, after studying at the University of Cincinnati, Stuart was elevated through a succession of positions culminating in his appointment as president and general manager of the corporation in February 1958. In 1963, he was designated as president and chairman of the board of directors, in which position he served until April 1969, when he relinquished his position as president but remained as a highly active chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, the measure of James M. Stuart's contribution to society is not merely gleaned from his important corporate responsibilities within the Dayton Power and Light Co., but through his dedicated infusion of time and effort to countless civic endeavors.

James M. Stuart was a valued member of the board of trustees of the University of Dayton, Wilberforce College and Wilmington College. He was a trustee of the Charles Kettering Foundation, a director emeritus of the Dayton Boys' Clubs, a director of junior achievement of Dayton, and a director of the Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra Association.

Because of his own humble beginnings, James M. Stuart never lost sight of the concerns of the ordinary worker, the backbone of any business enterprise. It was thought this special insight, Mr. Speaker, that James Stuart was able to use his important corporate positions for

the benefit of his employees and for the betterment of the Dayton community of which he was such an integral part.

Upon his retirement from active civic life, I take this opportunity to salute the lifelong efforts of this unique and public-spirited citizen.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC HISTORIC PARK

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am again pleased to introduce legislation to authorize the establishment of a War in the Pacific Historic Park in the territory of Guam. I am equally pleased to state that seven of my colleagues have also agreed to lend their support to this measure which seeks to create a permanent memorial to the bravery of those who fought and died in the Pacific for the United States in World War II.

The measure we put before the House today is similar to H.R. 16086, which was introduced on July 23, 1974. Although I had hoped the House Interior Committee might have provided this measure with a hearing in the 93d Congress, our bill became another casualty of the many national crises with which the Congress was forced to deal last year.

The need for this legislation to become law has been a long time in the making. Nowhere in the Pacific is there to be found a lasting memorial by Americans to our brothers who fought so hard to defeat a difficult enemy. This point is especially well remembered by two cosponsors of this bill, Representative RICHARD WHITE, Democrat of Texas, who served in the Pacific during the war, and Representative WILLIAM KETCHUM, who was with the U.S. Army during its invasion of Guam in 1944. Both of these fine gentlemen remember the horrors of those days and I am proud that they have continued their support to provide our fighting men and women with the monument they so richly deserve.

We believe that the time has come for America to act if we are to preserve those areas on Guam that were directly involved in the fierce fighting to liberate the island. If we do not act soon, I fear that private developers will overrun many of the more important sites and thus preclude any possibility of establishing a meaningful park.

The creation of the War in the Pacific Park on Guam would also be of significant value to the island's tourist business. It is ironic that 35 years after the war, the majority of Guam visitors are Japanese, many of whom either fought in the conflict itself or had parents who did. They want to visit old battlefield sites as much as do those of us who took part in the combat. There is no question in my mind that the creation of a suitable park would not only preserve the remaining vestiges of that fierce battle on Guam in July 1944, but

would serve as an enticement to bring thousands of visitors, hopefully, both from the Orient and from the States, to visit our island.

In recent years, the Japanese Government has constructed on privately owned property on Guam a memorial to honor their war dead. Is it not time for the United States to also act to honor those who gave so much in their country's time of need? The proposed War in the Pacific Park on Guam would be a fitting tribute of a grateful country. I therefore urge my colleagues in the 94th Congress to give this measure every consideration possible.

PHILADELPHIA ADDS SECOND MOBILE INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia's second mobile intensive care unit, providing special treatment for medical emergencies, was placed in service in my district in Northeast Philadelphia at Engine 62, Bustleton Avenue and Bowler Street, on Wednesday, February 26.

The rescue unit, manned by specially trained fire medics, is designed to provide on the scene advanced primary care in such life-threatening emergencies as a heart attack, drowning, electrocution, or suffocation.

The city's first mobile intensive care unit, operating out of Engine 43, 21st and Market Streets, responded to over 2,500 calls for assistance during its first year of operation.

The mobile intensive care units' fire medics undergo intensive training in the latest techniques employed in acute coronary care and may administer drugs and electric shock, defibrillation, to the patient under direct orders from a doctor in the hospital.

These sophisticated rescue units are equipped with special communication capabilities which enable the fire medic and the base station doctor to have voice contact. This enables the fire medic to give vital signs and other pertinent medical information to the base station physician, who in turn instructs the fire medic as to how best treat the patient. City Fire Commissioner Rizzo stated that these mobile intensive care units differ from other rescue vehicles in their specialized equipment and the ability of the personnel manning them. He added that four additional units will be placed in service throughout the city during the coming year, under a \$390,000 grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Princeton, N.J.

The grant was given to the Philadelphia Health Management Corp. to develop an improved emergency medical communication and transportation system for the Philadelphia community. The funds are being used to purchase the additional equipment and provide training at Philadelphia General Hos-

pital for the fire medics who will staff these units.

Commissioner Rizzo added that any one requiring emergency medical care should dial 911 and ask for "fire rescue." After determining the nature of the case, the central emergency medical dispatcher will refer it to the regular fire rescue, to the police unit, or to the new mobile intensive care emergency service.

REMARKS BY HON. LINDY BOGGS ON THE ELECTION OF HON. BARBARA JORDAN AS THE DEMOCRATIC WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in its 53 years of illustrious history the Woman's National Democratic Club has held an election among its members to name the Democratic Woman of the Year. It is with great pleasure that I announce to the House of Representatives that our colleague, the Honorable BARBARA JORDAN, of Texas, is the recipient of this honor. Ms. JORDAN will be honored at a dinner to be held by the club Wednesday, March 12, as the opening event of the new Wax Museum at 333 E Street SW.

Ms. JORDAN was selected by vote of the club's membership of over 2,000 women prominent in Democratic politics. Members cited her exemplary conduct during the Watergate hearings of the House Judiciary Committee as well as her success in overcoming dual prejudices against women and blacks in winning election to the Texas Senate in 1966 and to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972. In the Texas Senate as the first black since 1883, she was unanimously elected president pro tempore. The award winner was born in Houston, attended public schools there and graduated magna cum laude from Texas Southern University majoring in political science and history. She received a law degree from Boston University in 1959 and holds honorary doctor of law degrees from Boston, Tufts, and Howard Universities. In addition to the House Judiciary Committee, Ms. JORDAN is a member of the Government Operations Committee and the only woman on the Steering and Policy Committee of the House Democratic caucus.

As a past president of the Women's National Democratic Club, I am honored to be included among the 13 Democratic women in the House who will serve as honorary sponsors of the award dinner. On the evening's musical agenda are "Singing and Strumming" by Congressman JAMES SYMINGTON and Dixieland jazz by a trio of Congressmen, including RICHARDSON PREYER of North Carolina, and DEL CLAWSON of California, on saxophones, and ROBERT LEGGETT of California, on the coronet. Music for dancing will be provided by the Prophets, a popular five-piece rock, dance, and country music orchestra.

The award winning Ms. JORDAN will be introduced at the dinner by fellow Texan, Senator LLOYD BENTSEN. Another popular Texan, Liz Carpenter, will be master of ceremonies. Mary Munroe, WNDC president, will present the award.

FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS MORE FOR WAR IN INDOCHINA LACKS RATIONAL JUSTIFICATION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the President's request for \$500 million more for military aid to the corrupt and incompetent governments of South Vietnam and Cambodia coming at a time when he is urging the cutback of funds for millions of poor and elderly people in this country simply blows the mind. An objective person looking at the record of our involvement in Indochina in the last decade would have to conclude that a continuing request to pour good money after bad could only be made for reasons which have little to do with the accomplishment of any realistic American goal either in Southeast Asia or other parts of the world.

I remember some years ago a remark by a brilliant business executive, who was brought in to reorganize and revive a large corporation which was in a failing position. He succeeded. Upon being asked why he had closed so many branches of the company's business, he replied: "You don't have to go to Harvard Business School to know what to do with a branch that has been continually losing money."

Mr. Speaker, many excellent editorials and newspaper articles have been written recently pointing out the bankruptcy of the administration's Vietnam policy. I offer for the Record an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal of Tuesday, February 11, 1975, entitled, "Case for Vietnam Aid Still Lacks Substance." I also offer three brilliant and informative articles by the distinguished journalist Anthony Lewis reprinted from the New York Times. The editorial and articles follow these remarks:

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Feb. 11, 1975]

CASE FOR VIETNAM AID STILL LACKS SUBSTANCE

It would be hard to find a more eloquent champion of the cause of continued aid to South Vietnam than James J. Kilpatrick.

On the page opposite today, he has made all the arguments that President Ford has tried to make in his pleas to Congress. The essential difference is that while Mr. Ford cites the dollar figures, and now appears to be willing to reach some sort of compromise with Congress, Kilpatrick gives the arguments with all the emotional impact that Lyndon Johnson used to try to achieve.

This is precisely Kilpatrick's problem. Though he writes as well as anyone in the trade, his case remains as bankrupt as it was a decade or more ago. It shows the same lack of comprehension of the realities of Vietnam as those from which President Johnson suffered.

He waves the red shirt of communism, just

as Mr. Johnson did in his many exhortations to stop the flood at the 17th parallel.

"We are not talking of 'aid to President Thieu' or of 'proposing up the corrupt Thieu administration,'" Kilpatrick writes, and for this much, at least, we should be grateful.

What he is talking about, he says, is "the continuing struggle between freedom and slavery," and "the faint, flickering candle they have fought so valiantly to keep alive."

That, as Kilpatrick himself is wont to say, is utter rot. Had Kilpatrick done his homework on Vietnam, or spent time there talking to the Vietnamese people, he would know better.

Except for the small mandarin class, the Vietnamese people know nothing more about democracy than they do about communism. They were, until our massive incursion of more than 500,000 troops, a primitive, rural society tied not to any ideology or any form of government, but to the land they farmed and to the plots where their ancestors were buried.

From 1858, when the French invaded, until our troops left two years ago, they have been exploited by white foreigners and ruled by autocrats. They are still being ruled by an autocrat and now being asked to fight the white man's war without the white man's direct participation.

If the Thieu government commands "a large measure of popular support," as Kilpatrick says, why is it that in the 1968 election he only got 34 percent of the vote and felt compelled afterwards to throw his opponents in jail?

Why do his soldiers fight? Because it is a job in a land where a generation of war has made the traditional job of farming all but impossible. That, and the fact that the consequences of refusal have been shown to be indefinite prison terms, tiger cages or death.

In his memoirs, in case Kilpatrick has forgotten, President Eisenhower wrote that, had the unified free elections guaranteed by the Geneva Accord been held as scheduled in 1954, Ho Chi Minh would have won more than 80 percent of the vote. Ho Chi Minh is dead now, but his goals are not.

The United States tried for more than a decade, at a cost of more than 55,000 lives and \$100 million, to "win the minds and hearts of the people" of Vietnam. No foreign soldiers were involved on the other side. Our opponents were Vietnamese, fighting for the right to have their own country.

Did our soldiers lie and was our money squandered in vain? That is what both Kilpatrick and Mr. Ford seem to be asking now.

And the answer is: No, unless we now repeat the mistakes of the 1960s. What that war should have taught us is that we have neither the right nor the power to tell other people how their country should be run. We have no right to impose our will on a nation which has fought so long to be free of us.

If they did not die in vain, Congress will refuse to appropriate more money so that more men may die.

HENRY'S CAUSE IN VIETNAM

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Why is Henry Kissinger so determined to hold back the process of political change and accommodation in South Vietnam—a process that even rightwing Vietnamese want to begin? Why does he support President Thieu in his refusal to carry out the political terms of the 1973 peace agreement?

The answer goes back to the winter of 1969, when Kissinger came to Washington as President Nixon's assistant. One of the first things he did was to discuss Vietnam in a series of secret meetings with the Soviet ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. Marvin and Bernard Kalb disclose the meetings in their book, "Kissinger," and report that Kissinger made

"velled threats" of tough measures against North Vietnam. But they do not incite how tough.

Kissinger told Dobrynin that the Nixon administration would not hesitate to destroy North Vietnam if necessary to preserve a non-communist government in Saigon. He made clear that this was a basic American price for detente: The Soviets would be expected to help achieve a Vietnam settlement leaving the Saigon government in power, or at least to tolerate whatever measures the Americans used.

That background makes clear why the maintenance of a staunchly anti-communist government in Saigon—and in Phnom Penh—matters so much to the secretary of state. He has made it a symbol of manhood in his diplomacy.

One striking thing about the Kissinger position is how little it has to do with the wishes of the Vietnamese or the Cambodians. They must go on with a war, however destructive, because the end result of the political alternative might weaken Henry Kissinger's diplomatic posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

A second notable aspect is how the commitment to a particular outcome in Vietnam and Cambodia—an outcome attainable only by perpetual war—conflicts with the image of himself that Kissinger conveyed over the years to people who opposed the war. He made them think that he wanted to end the fighting and the American role in Indochina, but that he had to contend with hawkish elements inside the administration.

These are a third striking thing about Kissinger's decision, so fateful for the people of Indochina and the United States, to make Vietnam his symbol of strength. He made the decision without consulting Congress—or even informing it of his true thinking.

He complains about legislation restricting his freedom of action. But Congress has obviously been driven to that by its feeling that this secretary of state, more than any in memory, secretly commits the country to doubtful propositions.

The great mystery is why Henry Kissinger with all the important things he had and has to do for this country, chose to make a symbol of Vietnam, the graveyard of reputations. In any event, the time has come for Congress to see that American civilization is not symbolized by endless war in Indochina.

OFFICIALS SEEM DETERMINED TO REPEAT VIET MISTAKES

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON.—Anyone aware of what American leaders said on our way into Vietnam must have a sense, these days, of reliving the past. But it is not the pleasurable nostalgia of Proust. For what is familiar is the self-deception, the confusion of objectives.

"We cannot turn our backs on these embattled countries," President Ford has just said. "U.S. unwillingness to provide assistance to allies fighting for their lives would seriously affect our credibility throughout the world. And this credibility is essential to our national security."

Credibility. Nine years ago the late John T. McNaughton, assistant secretary of defense, said in a secret memorandum that our objective in Vietnam was not "to save a friend" but "to avoid humiliation" ourselves. Before his death he well knew how we had damaged ourselves in that false pursuit. Can anyone still believe that hanging on in Indochina has enhanced the world's belief in American strength and our ability to use it wisely?

National security. If we had allowed political events to take their own course in Indochina years ago, would Americans today have less or more faith in their national se-

curity leaders? Would we have been able to deal less or more effectively with our central security concerns, in the Middle East and elsewhere?

Secretary of State Kissinger said the other day that "the overwhelming objective" of the United States in the truce agreement of 1973 was not to end our role but only "to disengage American military forces from Indochina and to return our prisoners."

If the objective had been so limited, it could have been achieved years before 1973. But of course, it was not so limited. The aim was officially described as "peace with honor." That meant withdrawal of U.S. forces while maintaining a client government in Saigon. It meant, in short, winning: at last stopping the political process that began in Vietnam in 1945.

For a generation, American policy has been based on the illusion that some outside force—arms, advisers, bombs, men—can remake the politics of Indochina in our image. Always, there has been the belief in "victory."

All along that path of illusion and death, there were points at which American interests—to say nothing of the people of Indochina—would have been served by letting go.

Suppose that in 1945 President Truman had refused to help the French reenter Vietnam, or that after 1954 we had respected the Geneva agreement's ban on outside intervention. The most likely eventual result would have been a nationalist-communist government in Vietnam independent of China and the Soviet Union and generally helpful to stability. As late as 1963 North Vietnam was ready to settle for a separate, nonaligned but non-communist South. But the American government said no and went on pursuing the mirage of military victory.

Madmen now are planting bombs in order, they say, to change American policy in Indochina. But the way to change an unreasonable policy is by reason—and there is, no shortage of that if Congress resists manipulation and fear.

In a television interview the other night an NBC reporter asked President Ford, "How much longer and how deep does our commitment go to the South Vietnamese?" The President said:

"I don't think that there is any long-term commitment. As a matter of fact, the American ambassador there, Graham Martin . . . thinks that if adequate dollars which are translated into arms and economic aid—if that was made available, that within two or three years the South Vietnamese would be over the hump . . ."

OR SUSTENANCE FOR WAR?

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—A letter from Saigon: The writer says he is amazed at the American debate on aid to Vietnam. The argument seems to be all about war, he says—about arms to help President Thieu fight the communists for years more. Does no one in America think of politics instead of war? Does no one realize that even "rightists" in South Vietnam now want Thieu out of office so a deal can be negotiated with the communists and the fighting ended?

"Why isn't Kissinger doing anything toward a political solution?" he asks. "Is this his 'decent interval'—a useless massacre?"

There is a short answer to those anguished questions. American policy focuses on war in Vietnam, and feeds it, because Henry Kissinger would rather have war than any visible political alternative.

It is a surprising and a serious thing to say that an American secretary of state is deliberately holding back a process that might lead to the end of a gruesome war. But the evidence is there.

The peace agreement signed in Paris two

years ago called for a new phase of politics in South Vietnam. It promised political rights to all parties, freedom of movement between the military zones, release of political prisoners and the establishment of a national council of reconciliation.

The idea of all that was to open up a process—a process of political competition and accommodation instead of war.

But Thieu prevented that process from starting. He prohibited movement between zones, reclassified political prisoners as common criminals to keep them in jail and effectively banned all parties but his own. He not only refused to carry out the terms of the Paris agreement; he made it a crime to publish them in South Vietnam. And at the moment the cease-fire was to come into effect, he launched aggressive military operations.

But lately, the strategy of military aggressiveness and political intransigence has unraveled. The tide of battle has shifted, and inevitably doubts have grown in South Vietnam about the wisdom of relying on war instead of politics.

Communist military success has brought angry American talks about a massive offensive by North Vietnam. Given the failure to say anything about Saigon's actions after the truce, that outcry is almost comic in its hypocrisy. But it is also factually doubtful.

In South Vietnam, many former Thieu supporters have now turned against him. A Catholic movement leads the criticism. Even right-wing newspapers criticized Thieu as an obstacle to peace—until he closed them.

The political setting explains the mystery of Kissinger's demand for \$300 million more in military aid now. The Pentagon is having difficulty justifying that figure; privately, defense officials say the object is not so much military as "psychological." In short, the aim is to demonstrate the American commitment to Nguyen Van Thieu.

For that purpose, any amount that gets through Congress will serve. Just \$75 million, say, would enable Thieu to tell doubters that he still has America's support. Any amount would be a symbol of American willingness to go on with the policy of war and not politics—go on, as Gen. Fred C. Weyand, the army chief of staff, had the candor to say, for another five to 10 years.

BAN THE HANDGUN—NO. 2

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in recent weeks about the growing national outcry for strict Federal gun control legislation, including specifically a ban on the private possession of handguns. Despite the ability of the gun lobby to mobilize tremendous outpourings of mail to Congresspeople in opposition to such legislation, I believe that such sentiments are those of a small minority of the public. More indicative of the majority view are the statements of such responsible law enforcement officials as former New York City Police Commissioner Patrick Murphy, and former Washington, D.C., Police Chief Jerry Wilson, both of whom have supported the approach I am advocating.

Broadcasting and newspaper editors, too, have added their voices to the call for a handgun ban. The comments below were broadcast as an editorial over

WOR-TV in New York City from January 23 to 29, 1975.

WOR-TV EDITORIAL

Talks about gun control can get as fired-up as discussions about religion or politics. However, that is not reason to avoid re-examining gun control—a problem for which appropriate and definitive national legislation has still to be enacted.

In a past Channel 9 editorial we had pointed out that, "in recent weeks, New York City had seen more unprovoked shootings of policemen by small arms as well as sub-machine guns. It is almost certain that the guns used in those shootings were not registered." We asked further, "how do we keep guns out of the hands of criminals? Haters? The unbalanced?" Those same questions can still be raised currently in the wake of recent shootings in the City.

There are still more than 25 million handguns in the nation and statistics of murders committed with handguns continue to increase. Three-quarters of the murders in the United States are committed with small handguns called "Saturday Night Specials."

What is needed is legislation that would permit handguns only in the possession of police and security officers. We therefore advocate tough federal legislation that will require voluntary surrender of weapons and punishment for non-compliance, outlawing the sale of handguns and parts and stiff punishment for crimes committed with handguns.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. CLAIRE MARTI

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, it takes a special kind of person to recognize the gifts that exceptional children have to offer their families, friends, and communities. Only a special kind of talent will bring to the fore the love and trust that children who are mentally retarded have to give. Mrs. Claire Marti, mother of two exceptional children, is such a woman.

Mrs. Marti has been selected by the Parents and Friends of the Exceptional Child as the 1975 Woman of the Year. She is well deserving of the compliment and honor that the title designates. Not satisfied with raising children of her own, she trained as a teacher's aide to provide extra assistance in the class for exceptional children in Wolcott, Conn. As a result of her efforts, the town boasts of a Saturday morning recreational program for the children, which includes arts and crafts projects and physical education. Mrs. Marti has organized parents of exceptional children and has served on many committees in conjunction with Parents and Friends of the Exceptional Child.

Not only has she been a member of the Waterbury Association for Retarded Children—WARC—but she has worked on the board of directors and organized a WARC youth group. In all her efforts, Mrs. Marti has sought understanding, compassion and recognition for the exceptional child. She has succeeded in enriching the lives of so many exceptional children, their parents and friends that I welcome this opportunity to extend my deep appreciation for her efforts.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—CONGRESSIONAL ROLE APPLAUDED

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contained an excellent article by Joseph Kraft describing the differences in approach adopted by the Congress and the President in developing a national energy policy. Mr. Kraft has vividly pointed out the flaws in the President's program, and is generous in his praise for the initiatives taken by the Congress in developing a program that is more sensitive to the economic considerations that affect all Americans.

I would like to commend my colleagues who have been working so hard in recent weeks to hammer out a program that will not destabilize our economy. The energy conservation strategy they have proposed is economically feasible, politically practical and worthy of our vigorous support. I am hopeful that the administration will recognize the devastating economic impact that will result from the President's energy program, and will take steps to develop a compromise based on the excellent program developed by our colleagues Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ULLMAN and all those who worked so tirelessly to produce a sensible energy counterproposal.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the article by Mr. Kraft to my colleagues, and hope that they will take justifiable pride in the fine work that is being done by this Congress to meet our national energy goals. Mr. Kraft's article follows:

DEVELOPING AN ENERGY PROGRAM

(By Joseph Kraft)

The President and the Congress are getting together on energy, and the country may yet emerge with a responsible program. But in the process traditional roles are being reversed in a disquieting way.

Mr. Ford is coming on more and more as a mere catalytic agent with deep loyalties to the special interests. He is leaving the congressional leaders the responsible work of balancing among conflicting factions.

The President's chief role in energy has been to set the pace. His program, and the relentless selling of it across the country, focused attention on the problem. A particular feature of the program—progressive application of a tariff on crude oil—forced the Congress to move with dispatch.

But in substance the Ford program was pathetic. Its centerpiece was a decision to cut consumption of foreign oil by one million barrels per day by the end of 1975. That figure had no rationale. It apparently was the nice round number used by Henry Kissinger in foreign negotiations, and then foisted upon the White House without serious analysis of its impact on the American economy.

Having picked an arbitrary target, the President then accepted ideological means for reaching the goal. He and his advisers hooked themselves on the mechanism of the market. They proposed—by raising tariffs and by deregulating prices of oil and gas—to give private industry incentive to curtail imports of foreign oil while producing more energy from different sources in this country.

It is extremely doubtful, given the propensity to consume gasoline no matter what the price, that the administration program would reach its target. It seems likely that it would

slug the economy by raising prices at a time of inflation and curtailing demand at a time of recession. What is absolutely certain is that it would mean a tremendous ripoff for the producers of oil, gas, coal and other forms of energy.

In the face of that monstrosity, the Democratic leaders in the Congress went to work with a vengeance. A Senate coordinating committee headed by John Pastore, a House coordinating committee headed by James Wright and the House Ways and Means Committee under Al Ullman all produced energy programs. While differing in detail, they all rejected the basic ideas of the Ford approach.

The Democratic plans all subordinate the one-million-barrel-a-day reduction target to the need to recover from recession and to master inflation. They all provide that conservation of oil be phased in as the recession ebbs.

Instead of using the market to achieve conservation and new production, the Democratic programs rely heavily on government muscle. Auto manufacturers would be obliged to produce cars that guzzle less gasoline and utilities would be forced to burn coal. The taxes used to curtail consumption would be weighted against the biggest users of gasoline. Instead of a tariff, which would leave a decision to import or not up to the big oil companies, the Democrats propose a quota which the government would manage.

The upshot is a program that does far less damage to the economy and is far more likely to reach the target of easing American dependence on foreign oil. Industry ripoffs are limited, if not entirely eliminated.

Because the two sets of programs are so far apart, bridging them is not going to be easy. But the President is obviously disposed to compromise, and the odds are that a reasonable program can be worked out.

The prospective happy ending on energy, however, offers little ground for general rejoicing. Nobody can be sure that congressional leaders will continue to be as responsible and courageous as they have proved themselves on energy. It is hard to feel comfortable with a President who enters so willingly into the role of spokesman for the auto and oil companies, and who inquires so unsuspiciously into the recommendations of his foreign policy advisers and the ideology of his economic advisers.

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues and my Bulgarian American friends in celebrating Bulgarian Independence Day. In 1876, the Bulgarian people revolted against their Turkish rulers, and Bulgaria was granted the status of a principality in 1878. Finally, in 1908, Bulgaria's aspirations toward independence were fulfilled and Bulgaria became a nation.

Any celebration, however, is marred by the knowledge that Bulgaria is suffering under the yoke of Communist domination. Bulgarian Americans mark Bulgarian Independence Day with formal celebrations and banquets, thereby recording their hope that their former homeland, now under Communist control, will soon regain its independence.

Let us join with these people in this

hope, the hope that Bulgaria and the rest of Eastern Europe will one day be free, again, of the omnipresence of communism and communism's nursemaid, Russia. Let us not forget in these days of "détente" with Russia that Russia holds half a continent captive, and that to this date, Russia has never yet relinquished territory it has made captive.

Let all the free world remember the plight of the Bulgarians, and let all the free world take heed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING RIGHTS GUARANTEE ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the Federal Employee Administrative Hearing Rights Guarantee Act. I am happy to announce that eight of my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. HARRIS—have joined me in sponsoring this measure.

On April 16, 1974, the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision in Arnett against Kennedy. This case is but the latest in a line of cases dealing with the problem of termination or suspension of Federal employees in the competitive service. These cases are noted primarily for their failure to answer the important and ultimate question whether Federal employees have a protected right to their jobs after completing the probationary period, that is, whether they can be terminated or suspended without a prior hearing on the merits. The opinion in Arnett against Kennedy is similarly ambiguous on the question and offers little hope for a person looking for a clear statement of rights.

Mr. Speaker, since the decision in Arnett against Kennedy which prompted my original introduction of the Hearing Rights Act in the 93d Congress, the President has made an Executive order which places all termination and suspension actions within the Civil Service Commission. While this order might have some merit in reducing the unevenness formerly present when the agencies handled their own cases, it offers no substantial defined right to an employee subject to an adverse action other than that of a different forum. The larger question of due process is still quite up in the air.

The courts and agencies are not entirely to blame. The law is unclear because Congress has not acted unequivocally regarding pretermination hearings. There is no statute which clearly mandates the promulgation of uniform regulations in the area. The law as it now stands leaves the whole matter of pretermination hearings for Federal employees without constitutionally inspired standards and thus opens the door to

agency abuse of employees who in good conscience criticize agency procedures or disclose agency wrongs and coverups. There are well known cases: for instance, those of Ernest Fitzgerald and Gordon Rule, employees of the Federal Government who have spoken out, been fired, and eventually won their rights to back pay and reinstatement. These cases, however, have involved employees in difficult fights and drawn out periods without pay. For sure, our veterans have a preference right to a hearing before termination, and some employees, through contract, have a similar right. But many others are without this fundamental protection and must suffer without pay while waiting to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Federal Employee Administrative Hearing Rights Guarantee Act is to guarantee all employees in the competitive service a prompt evidentiary hearing by an impartial individual prior to the time that removal or suspension without pay is effective. The bill declares that certain minimum protections are due such an employee before termination or suspension, among them, the right to see the evidence supporting the action and to have a transcript of the proceedings. I share the opinion of the many unions of Federal employees who have contacted me—among them the National Treasury Employees Union and the Overseas Education Association—that it is time for congressional action on this problem. As long as Congress continues in its inaction, Federal employees will not be protected against arbitrary and capricious dismissal for speaking out. The public interest and pocketbook are badly served by stifling creative criticism from employees of our Government.

LAND USE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, our colleague from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) addressed the National Conference of the National Association of Counties here in Washington. Mr. UDALL spoke on "Land Use and the Environment," a subject on which he is a national authority and congressional leader.

Land use is certainly an issue of great concern to county and local officials and the Land Use and Resource Conservation Act of 1975, H.R. 3510, which Mr. UDALL and I cosponsor, was developed with careful attention to preserving the traditional role of local government in most land use decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. UDALL's remarks are well worth the Members' attention and they are reprinted below:

LAND USE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

It is a real privilege to be here with you today and to share some of my thoughts with you about land use and the environment, and related matters of concern to counties. During my tenure in Congress and

as a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, I have worked closely with county officials and the National Association on many issues, including land use. As a Congressman from a Western state in which over 75% of the land is owned by the Federal government, I am also acutely sensitive to problems of coordination between Federal and State and local officials, particularly in the area of land and resource management.

Let me begin with a few remarks about land use. As you probably know, there was a serious setback for land use last year when the House voted last July not to continue debate on the land use bill I sponsored. Despite the setback in the 93rd Congress, our land use problems are not going to go away. National land use legislation is still a high priority item and will certainly be considered again in this Congress.

Thousands of acres of our best agricultural land are still being developed for a multitude of other purposes without regard to our future agricultural needs. Our pollution and congestion problems continue and are aggravated, and we continue to waste energy like no other country in the world, in large part due to our land use patterns and practices. I think it is time we learned from our past mistakes and made a national commitment to develop some sensible land use procedures and policies on the State and local levels—with Federal coordination and financial assistance—which can help us to create the decent future society we all want.

For the question is not whether we are going to continue to grow, for grow we must and we will. The question is rather will we do so with some wisdom and foresight. Where will we put the factories and feedlots, and powerplants and refineries, and the schools, housing, and highways and pipelines that we will need in the next few decades? If the experts are correct, we will have to build again in the next 30 years all that we have built before—that means an area of land the size of New Jersey will be converted to urban uses each decade.

Let's look at some examples. On one extreme, in my state of Arizona, enough land has been subdivided right now to accommodate over 2 million people. That's more than the entire population of the State. By the year 2000, if present trends continue, over 5 million acres, or roughly 15% of the private land in the State, will have been subdivided into one-acre lots for sale, with little or no guarantee that you will ever see any residential development or community facilities because of the very nature of these developments.

On the other hand, we see a variety of forecasts that our best agricultural land is slowly but surely being consumed by various kinds of urban sprawl. In the state of Michigan, for example, one prediction is that the state will be 5 million acres short of the agricultural land it needs to be self-sufficient by the year 2000—that if present trends continue, ten out of their twelve million acres of crop land in that state, will be lost in the next thirty years.

And let's look at energy conservation. The Arab oil boycott finally forced us to look at our extravagant energy consumption habits. The most sensible thing we can do in this country to achieve energy independence is through energy conservation. If we cut our consumption 20%—not an unrealistic goal—we could reduce imports by $\frac{1}{2}$ or \$10 billion a year.

This waste is most evident in our patterns of land use. Sprawl is costly in terms of energy. Studies have shown that a "high density planned development"—which by the way has just as much open space as is in present suburbia—utilizes $\frac{1}{2}$ the energy as the low density sprawl we are used to seeing. The street design, for one thing, would be different. By better planning for future neighborhood street patterns alone, we could save a billion and a half barrels

of oil from gasoline alone. That's a year's worth of imports.

And the same studies show that better planning of our residential patterns could also cut pollution in half, and also utility costs. I submit to you that energy conservation must become a more important element of land use planning.

The fundamental question is whether there is any need for Federal legislation to do anything about all these problems. And I might add that they are not just environmental problems, but have tremendous social and economic costs as well. My answer is, yes, the Federal government can and must do something about land use, but the real job must be done at the grass roots and the State level, for here lies the authority and the familiarity with particular State and local problems.

The quiet revolution in land use is real and is energizing more and more communities. Citizens are becoming involved, at least on ad hoc basis, in at least the more visible land use crises.

The Federal government, however, can play an important role—and certainly has a good deal of work to do to put its own house in order. Indeed, there are many who claim that the Federal government is actually the worst culprit when it comes to land use, for Federal money, grants, and other activities and policy decisions permit flow daily from Washington to all sections of every State, in ways which have significant and long-lasting effects on growth and urban sprawl. In my opinion, it is time we brought some order to these Federal actions and made an attempt to coordinate with State and local plans to at least assure that the Federal presence is not disruptive and does not detract from local and State government plans for controlling and influencing growth. In addition, the Federal government, as you know, is our biggest landowner, controlling over a third of the nation's land. Much needs to be done to develop management and planning guidelines for the public lands, and to assure that there is ample coordination between Federal and local land managers.

I would like to turn for a moment to an important energy related element of the land use equation—one which will receive a great deal of attention in this Congress while we attempt to develop some national energy policies and work toward that perhaps Utopian goal of "energy self-sufficiency". The Nixon-Ford Administrations have put a great deal of emphasis on Project Independence. The Administration wants to proceed at once to develop our domestic sources of petroleum, coal, oil shale and nuclear power and other resources. There are, however, some tradeoffs involved here, and some significant costs for some areas if this anticipated development is not handled with some foresight and common sense.

Let's take a few examples:

The Administration says we will need 640 new electric generating plants in operation by 1985, and that because of the lead time involved developing and constructing such major facilities, it is crucial that the planning and siting decisions be made in the next few years.

President Ford, in his State of the Union address, set some additional energy goals for 1985: 200 nuclear power plants, 250 new coal mines, 150 major coal-fired power plants, 30 major new oil refineries, 20 major new synthetic fuel plants, thousands of new oil wells and a million barrels of synthetic fuels and oil shale a day. Again, most of these major facilities involve tremendous planning and siting problems, and create land use shockwaves which could determine the quality of life in the areas affected for many generations.

My point in sponsoring comprehensive land use legislation and the simple question that I pose to you today, is whether we can afford

not to promote some rational land use planning in the States and counties to be affected by the above-described scenario.

The President's response is a request for specific energy siting legislation. To bring the States up to speed, the President would mandate that States develop an energy siting program, subject to Federal approval, in 18 months or face the alternative of an energy siting program that is implemented by the Federal government.

Energy facility siting is, to be sure, a major problem. There hasn't been a major refinery built on the East Coast, for example, in 15 years, primarily because of local resistance. Moreover, industry complains with a great deal of justification about the 40 to 50 agency approvals that must be obtained from all levels of government before construction can begin. We do need some better mechanisms to eliminate such duplication and reconcile conflicts between different agencies and levels of government. Yet I am convinced that energy siting is but one piece of the land use puzzle, and that the economic, environmental and social problems that accompany projects of this magnitude will not be solved by another single-focus Federal program. Instead energy siting should be treated in a comprehensive manner within the State's land use program. I think the emphasis should be on developing comprehensive land use planning as an alternative to yet another mission-oriented single purpose Federal program to facilitate energy production at the expense of other values. A land use program such as is envisioned in the legislation I am again sponsoring will help the States to do their energy planning within the context of these other values and resources and without the Federal government having the last word.

Many of you here today are from Western States, and some from coastal States, and so I am sure you are aware of the issues that have been framed by the Administration's plans for developing of the Outer Continental Shelf and our Western energy resources. There will be new boom-towns as the power plants go up and new coal mines open up, and an accompanying need for housing, schools, water and sewage facilities, along with the usual law enforcement and other social problems that accompany rapid growth. Some of the Western governors have already recognized the serious consequences, and are speaking out for a stronger State role in energy policy. They don't want their States turned into "energy colonies" or "boiler rooms" to feed the rest of the nation's energy needs at the expense of their way of life and environmental values and I don't blame them.

There is going to have to be some planning, some front money to provide for the public facilities, and some protection for the environment.

Let me emphasize again that the land use legislation before the Congress does not provide a Federal blueprint, but instead the financial incentives to enable States and local governments to control their own destinies concerning how and where they will grow. It reflects the need for diversity within the Federal system, and recognizes the fact that land use decisions should be made at the local and State level with regional and interstate cooperation where appropriate.

Perhaps even more importantly, it provides for a stronger State role by providing a check on Federal programs, monies and activities that significantly affect land use in the State. Under my bill, once a State develops a land use program, Federal actions affecting land use must be certified as consistent with the State land use program, except where the national interest is clearly at stake, as determined by the President. This important provision illustrates the need for local control and the need to coordinate the multitude of Federal activities that affect land use.

If you will take the time to read the legislation and not just the propaganda that has been circulated which has characterized it as an evil Federal takeover of poverty rights—you will, I believe, conclude that it is a balanced approach and stresses State and local control. This approach is quite similar to that taken in the Coastal Zone Management Act under which most coastal States are now developing management programs for their coastal zones. Again, the spectre of millions of acres of the OCS leased for development has alerted the coastal States to the importance of gaining a stronger voice in energy decisions and some time for planning the on-shore impact of such development. The Coastal Zone Act gives the coastal States similar leverage to deal with the feds.

Last year, during the deliberations on the land use legislation, we spent a great deal of time working with State and local government people to assure that their interests and problems were considered. The present legislation reflects these concerns, and mandates an important role for counties and local governments in the development and implementation of land use programs. Most land use decisions will continue to be made at the local level, but we must also recognize that some of our land use problems don't stop at jurisdictional lines and are becoming more and more regional in scope. With the proliferation of agencies and governmental entities involved in land use, there is also a need for the State to be more involved in setting broad policies and reviewing decisions which have impact beyond an immediate jurisdiction.

The issue of local control is an important one, but let me just say that the existing multitude of single-purpose Federal programs may have led to local control being more of a myth than a reality. For better or for worse, there is now an enormous Federal presence in land use and growth issues, through sewer and waste water programs, public works projects, Corps of Engineers projects, airport and highway monies, and a multitude of Federal laws and regulations from Federal floodplain zoning requirements to clean air regulations. It is this kind of Federal presence which led Daniel Moynihan to remark that "Yes, we have a national growth policy, it is in the interstate highway system."

The land use bill is an honest attempt to return some of this authority to the State and local level, to energize State and local governments to tackle their land use problems.

Let me shift here to discuss a few points concerning related problems with Federal ownership of public lands. The question is how we coordinate the planning and management of public lands, which in many States represents over half the total land area, with land use planning in the private or non-federal sector?

I am a strong believer in coordinating wherever possible the planning and management activities for public lands with the land use programs for the States within which the public lands are located.

It is clear by now that the basic policy of the Federal government is going to be one of retaining ownership of most all of the public lands. This was the recommendation of the Public Land Law Review Commission, and I support it. Yet I recognize and want to do something about the more fundamental problem that this creates for the States and counties who must forego the tax revenue that would otherwise be available if these lands were on the tax rolls.

I have sponsored legislation and held hearings in my Subcommittee on proposals to establish a more equitable system of payments in lieu of taxes for the Federal natural resource lands which are presently exempt from local and State taxation.

The present hodge-podge of Federal stat-

utes which allocate a portion of the revenue generated from mineral, forest, and grazing, and other receipts generated on these lands are both outdated and inadequate to deal with the current revenue problems in most counties where schools and other public services must be financed by the property tax. During my work on the Public Land Law Review Commission, I learned a great deal about these problems, and last year even more from hearings both here and in Washington and in the State of Utah. While I recognize that there are certainly some benefits involved in having National Forests, National Parks and BLM land within one's county, I have concluded, as did the Public Land Law Review Commission, that the burdens generally outweigh the benefits and something must be done to remedy the inequity. Forest receipts, which average for most counties a nickel an acre are hardly adequate to make up for the property tax which could otherwise be levied.

If the public lands are, for the most part, going to remain in Federal ownership for all the American people, I think we owe it to those counties who carry this burden to spread it equitably among all the taxpayers.

And, I think that establishing an equitable system for payments in lieu of taxes is closely related to land use planning problems on both the public and private domain. Environmentalists, for example, will probably support such legislation because they see this as a way of reducing the pressure to exploit our natural resources to maximize revenues. It also would provide the counties and States with additional revenues to support their basic services, which would relieve them from some need to constantly search for new ways to generate tax revenue, promoting perhaps hastily considered industrial development.

And, as I learned in Utah last fall, the impact of the proposed energy development in that State and many similarly situated States is going to put a serious strain on the economic and social fabric of many of the counties involved.

As one witness in Utah summed it up last fall, "The day the Arabs turned the oil spigot off, the lifestyle and future of Utah changed dramatically." If coal leasing, coal slurry, oil shale, power plants, and coal gasification develops as rapidly as anticipated, it is going to require not only planning but substantial adjustments, and some front money to provide for the growth induced in such areas.

As Governor Rampton pointed out in his testimony in Salt Lake last September, most of the vast deposits of our energy resources are located in these public land counties, but the growth induced by these activities may well be in the neighboring county. How do you compensate the impacted area is a problem we must carefully consider.

In summary, let me just say that I think the issues that I have briefly outlined here today are closely related and of great importance to the whole country. The Congress must come to grips with our energy and economic problems, but we must also provide some sensible land use guidelines for the public domain and some coordination and stimulus for local and State planning as well. Land use is still the most fundamental unaddressed environmental problem in this nation and one which is closely related to many of our air and water pollution and energy conservation problems. I intend to make a major effort to see this legislation enacted in the 94th Congress. It is time we made a serious commitment to address the environmental, economic and social costs of sprawl, and developed some sensible land use planning at all levels of government.

Let me conclude by saying that I have enjoyed working with the National Association of Counties on many issues of common inter-

est in the past and that I look forward to a good working relationship during this Congress.

Thank you.

OTHER VOICES

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a thoughtful article by Ms. Jessica Mitford on political suppression in Iran; the article appeared in the column entitled "Other Voices" in the San Francisco Examiner, February 16, 1975.

Ms. Mitford, a noted social critic, has ably documented the substantial evidence which has been gathered recently indicating that the Shah of Iran has built a system of government which not only suppresses political and religious opposition, but also refuses to tolerate the faintest hint of any "anti-Shah" economic or financial opinions. While the Shah denies specific allegations of suppressions, he has admitted that his government is less than democratic: to use his own words, he has confessed:

When my people begin acting like Swedes, I shall begin to act like the Swedish king.

The U.S. Government prizes its good relationship with Iran and, indeed, conscientiously works to enhance it. Last year alone we sold some \$4 billion in weapons to Iran; we even gave coveted positions in our military academies—a move which I strongly opposed when it was proposed to the House several years ago—for Iranian students. I think in light of the allegations made by Ms. Mitford and responsible journalists in both Europe and the United States we should reevaluate these policies, and begin to consider the quality of the governments with which we do our business.

I commend Ms. Mitford's article to the attention of my colleagues:

OTHER VOICES: A DIFFERENT VIEW OF THE SHAH OF IRAN

(By Jessica Mitford)

For two successive Sundays, readers of the Examiner were treated to a lengthy running eulogy of "one of the world's most interesting and impressive leaders . . . a fascinating personality . . . a wise, patriotic, benevolent ruler," the Shah of Iran.

In his Editor's Report, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., tells us that "over a delicious lunch, we soon found His Majesty a gracious host with a lively sense of humor . . . however, the profound intelligence of this enlightened ruler quickly became apparent when we started discussing serious subjects."

Among serious subjects that did not, it seems, come up for discussion during the delicious lunch:

The despotic rule of Iran by SAVAK, the much dreaded, Gestapo-like secret police, answerable to the Shah alone.

The estimated 40,000 political prisoners who have disappeared into Iran's jails.

The use by SAVAK of unspeakably brutal tortures to extract information and uncounted summary executions of those who refuse to turn informer.

"What impressed me most about the Shah's

March 4, 1975

attitude was the reasonableness with which he listened to another point of view," wrote Mr. Hearst.

This has hardly been the experience of the Shah's subjects.

More than two years ago a United Nations panel found "a consistent pattern" of violations of human rights by SAVAK.

These included "arbitrarily arresting hundreds of political dissidents, holding secret trials for them, and in scores of instances executing them." Since that time, much more has come to light about the organization and modus operandi of SAVAK.

Last November, Time magazine reported that SAVAK, through a large network of informers, "have been responsible for making countless arrests of leftists on occasionally vague anti-Shah charges and for at least 200 executions."

In a Harper's magazine article from Iran, Frances Fitzgerald writes:

"SAVAK has agents in the lobby of every hotel, every government department, every university classroom."

The estimated number of agents: 70,000 or one for every 450 Iranians—and SAVAK officials themselves acknowledge this is only the nucleus, for they have more unpaid informers than paid agents.

"Professors are fired or arrested for expressing independent views, and students are arrested or shot for demonstrating," says Fitzgerald. "SAVAK gives no accounting of its activities. People simply disappear in Iran."

Last month the London Sunday Times reported on its two-year investigation of torture allegations in Iran based on personal testimony of prisoners and statements of impartial foreign observers.

"Torture cases fall in three categories. Left-wing activists, Moslem dissidents opposed to what they regard as the religious and political repression of the Shah; and those people, predominantly middle-class intellectuals, who were unwise enough to criticize the regime, in private or public and were reported to police."

Methods of torture include extraction of fingernails and toenails, electric shock to sexual organs, and the "Hot Table," an iron frame covered with wire mesh electrically heated to which the prisoner is strapped until it becomes red hot.

Two French lawyers, visiting an Iranian trial as observers for a non-political international association of jurists, attested to the results of this fiendish device.

In court, the accused prisoner attracted their attention by whispering, "Mister! Mister!" and suddenly hiked up his shirt.

"The whole of the middle of his chest and stomach was a mass of twisted scars from very deep burns. They looked appalling . . . The skin was covered in shiny scars from burning . . ."

(NOTE.—In a recent interview with Mike Wallace in the program "60 Minutes," the Shah denied the accuracy of the Times' torture allegations.)

"One of the things that pleased me most about this innovative, modern monarch was the friendliness he expressed for the United States," writes Mr. Hearst. Little wonder, since the Shah reigns courtesy of the CIA.

In 1953, a combination of nationalists and leftwing opposition forced him to flee the country. According to the Sunday Times, "he returned after one week, with the aid of a popular uprising orchestrated by the CIA." Richard Helms, CIA director during the Watergate break-in, now serves as United States ambassador to Iran.

Further insight into the "profound intelligence of this enlightened ruler" is furnished in an interview by the Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci.

Shah: "What do these feminists want? Equality, you say? Indeed! I don't want to

seem rude, but . . . you may be equal in the eyes of the law, but not, I beg your pardon for saying so, in ability. You've never even produced a great cook. You have produced nothing great, nothing!"

Fallaci: "How many political prisoners are there in Iran today?"

Shah: "I don't know the exact figure. It depends on what you mean by political prisoners. If it's Communists you mean, for instance, I don't consider them political prisoners because communism is against the law. It follows that a Communist is not a political prisoner but a common criminal."

Among current cases of imprisonment and torture of political prisoners authenticated by Amnesty International and by the Committee for Artistic and Intelligence Freedom in Iran, a group of distinguished American writers, are:

Vida Hadjebi Tabrizi, a sociologist at the University of Teheran, sentenced to eight years imprisonment by a military court in July, 1972, for investigating the living conditions of Iran's peasant population. She has been subjected to such harsh torture she has lost all feeling in hands and feet and has developed serious heart trouble.

Dr. G. H. Sa'edi, Iran's greatest playwright, under torture in prison since June, 1974.

Dr. A. Shariatti, a well-known writer and religious intellectual, imprisoned since September, 1973. His father, over 70 years old, was also arrested. Both have been tortured.

The man responsible for these atrocities appears to be Mr. Hearst's nominee for Leader of the Free World.

Deploring the "inability of leaders" in the democratic countries from Denmark to Japan "to make strong decisions and have them implemented," Mr. Hearst concludes from his discussion with the Shah that "any other or all the developing—yes, and many of the developed countries—could use such a wise, patriotic, benevolent ruler. . . . Perhaps the underlying problem is that the West simply has no really great leaders left, or even emerging."

For which we may be profoundly grateful.

THE VALUE OF A SECOND OPINION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Ford Foundation released a report of a study on America's energy future. The study, entitled "A Time To Choose," cost \$4 million and attempts to chart a national policy for our Nation's energy production, distribution, and costs. Basically, it recommends cutting back on the use of energy and the imposition of mandatory controls.

Another foundation, the Institute for Contemporary Studies, has prepared a critique and analysis of the Ford study. Ten economists, with a basic belief in our free enterprise system, have taken a second look. Their critiques of the Ford study have been put together in a volume entitled "No Time To Confuse."

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member of this body to read "No Time To Confuse" if they are truly interested in preserving our free enterprise system and developing an energy policy which is capable of meeting the future needs of the Nation.

THE URANIUM CARTEL—A REAL WORLD MONOPOLY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as mentioned previously, see page 4989 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indications are here that we are heading for a uranium shortage. This will lead to a new fuel crisis for our nuclear powerplants. The frightening thing about all this is that a very small group of people control almost the entire known supply of the material. Forbes magazine on January 15, 1975, described this tight little operation. The article follows:

THE FIVE ARROWS, NUCLEAR-STYLE

Control of the uranium cartel may be far more concentrated than would appear at first glance. As suggested by the fist clenching five arrows in the family crest, the Rothschilds of France and England have an interest in nearly every major uranium mine in the world.

Rio Tinto Zinc, a mining company in which the French Rothschilds have traditionally been major owners, holds a controlling interest in Rio Algom Mines, whose Canadian mines have the largest uranium reserves in North America. RTZ owns nearly two-thirds of the huge new Rossing uranium mine in South West Africa. It also controls Mary Kathleen Uranium, the only Australian uranium mine capable of going into operation soon.

The largest South African gold producer, Anglo American Corp., is also the country's largest uranium producer, since South African uranium is produced as a by-product of gold production. One of Anglo American's associated companies, Charter Consolidated, has a Rothschild on its board, and owns nearly 10% of RTZ.

The centerpiece of the French Rothschilds' nonferrous metal group is Imetal (formerly Le Nickel), which has a controlling share of the Mokta and Pennaroya companies, two of the largest uranium producers in France and in the former French colonies of Gabon and Niger. They also participate in joint ventures with the other large French producer, Pechiney Ugine Kuhlmann.

The Rothschild presence is everything. Baron Guy de Rothschild heads Imetal. He also sits on the board of RTZ. In turn, Harry Oppenheimer, the chief executive of Anglo American, and Sir Val Duncan, the chief executive of RTZ, sit on the board of Imetal.

Only in Australia do the Rothschild companies have a relatively small share of the total uranium reserves. In fact, but for a few independent uranium companies in Canada and possible increased Australian production, the function of the Uranium Producers' Forum could be performed at a board meeting of Imetal.

CIA DOMESTIC OPERATIONS RAISE SERIOUS QUESTIONS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Central Intelligence

Agency has come under increasing criticism for alleged domestic spying activities although its statutory authority limits its jurisdiction to overseas intelligence operations.

Recently Mr. William Colby, Director of the CIA, testified before a House Appropriations Subcommittee concerning domestic spying and wiretapping. He amended an earlier report filed with the committee to change certain figures with respect to the number of telephone taps, files on public officials, and break-ins.

The Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial emphasized the dangers inherent in CIA activities in this Nation which exceed its statutory authority. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial in the Record herewith:

MR. COLBY'S OWN WORDS RAISE LEVEL OF CONCERN

The response of Mr. William Colby to the investigations of the Central Intelligence Agency is about what one would expect from almost any bureaucratic agency that comes under criticism.

Mr. Colby, the director of the CIA, said that American intelligence operations have been jeopardized by "the almost hysterical excitement" over CIA missteps.

What Mr. Colby sees as "almost hysterical excitement" is a deep concern on the part of the Congress and the American public over the fact the CIA has ignored the law of the land that created it in the first place.

Mr. Colby told the House appropriations subcommittee that allegations of illegal or improper domestic spying had been blown out of proportion. Yet, under questioning, Mr. Colby said that the CIA has had files on four congressmen and he did not deny that the agency used sex traps within the U.S. to gain information from foreigners. He also confirmed the report of Mr. Seymour Hersh of The New York Times that 22 CIA agents infiltrated antiwar dissident groups and collected files on 10,000 Americans.

Mr. Colby denied this was a "massive illegal domestic intelligence operation." He prefers to look on it as a misstep. Obviously a few missteps such as this only open the doors to custom. In short, once the law of the nation is breached, it becomes easier and easier to do it again and in practice, the agency set up to help guard the country from without becomes the Big Brother from within.

Mr. Colby was quick enough to try to hint at a lack of credibility in press reports. But ironically he took the occasion to submit to the lawmakers what he called "minor changes" in a report he gave the Senate Appropriations Committee last month.

His "minor changes" are interesting. He said:

The CIA conducted telephone wiretaps against 27 people between 1947 and 1965, not 21 as he told the Senators.

Four of the persons whose phones were tapped were non-CIA employees, not two as he had said.

The agency had files on four congressmen, not one as he told the committee.

The agency had conducted four break-ins in the United States, not three as he said before.

In actual numbers that may not be a great difference, and probably Mr. Colby thinks of it only as an understatement. The fact remains that he misinformed the senators, and who can say that he is not also misinforming the House subcommittee?

Mr. Colby has admitted enough to make it clear the CIA violated both the spirit and the letter of the laws, and he now seems to

be pleading that the Congress should look no further into the scope of this lest it destroy the intelligence operation.

What has to be done is the task of bringing the nation's intelligence agencies under discipline. It will be less painful and costly now than it would be later on.

During the infancy of this great country, a wise observer once said: "The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break it, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

The CIA has already demonstrated that when vigilance is lacking, it knows no boundaries or laws in the exercise of its power.

GLENVIEW, ILL., HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT WINS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST IN ILLINOIS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to announce to the House of Representatives that Mr. Dean Phelus, 500 Elm Street, Glenview, Ill., has submitted the winning speech from Illinois in the Voice of Democracy Contest. This contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary and is a part of the Voice of Democracy scholarship program. This program is conducted annually in our Nation's secondary schools during the fall term. This year, the theme for the VFW's 28th annual program is "My Responsibility as a Citizen."

The winner of the contest from Illinois, Mr. Dean Phelus, is a junior from Maine Township High School North, Des Plaines, Ill. Dean is 16, has served as the treasurer of the Spanish Club and vice president of the speech team, has been awarded a number of speech awards including a speech scholarship, is a varsity member of the track team, is a member of the district concert choir, and belongs to the Modern Music Masters and Thespians.

As the State of Illinois winner, Dean Phelus is eligible for one of five national scholarships awarded as the top prizes. Final judging is to be held here in Washington, D.C., during the week of March 7-12, 1975. The best wishes of the people of the State of Illinois go to Dean as he competes with the contest winners from other States.

Mr. Speaker, this speech by a high school junior has an important message for all Americans. It is that America needs listeners, optimists, and believers—those who will offer "a cheer, a word of encouragement, a suggestion, a vote of confidence." Dean Phelus writes:

Every American should be involved enough to vote, to honor his country, to feel grateful for the great gift of freedom . . . (and to march) forward together to a future which offers uncertainty and challenge.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the winning speech of Mr. Dean Phelus of Glenview, Ill., to congratulate him on his fine speech, and to commend

the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their worthy efforts:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Dean Phelus)

LISTEN!

Listen! All those of you who are lucky enough to be citizens of America, listen! What do you hear? The voice of democracy? What is it? Is it the voice of one man? Does he sit in an oval office, or at the wheel of a truck, or on the bench in a football stadium? Is it the voice of one woman who stands in a classroom or a department store or a kitchen? No. The voice of democracy is an American chorus, a patriotic cheer, a chant by a million separate voices. And my responsibility as an American citizen is to . . . listen!

What are Americans saying these days? We can't afford the groceries, the automobiles aren't as sturdy as they could be; where will we get enough fuel?; what do we do about the young people?; how will we make it through difficult times? Questions. The voices are asking a hundred thousand hard questions. Answers. What the voices want are answers. And all they need to do is . . . listen.

No great organization operates without problems. A great country is no different. Each one of us can see the questions all around us. What we need are voices with answers. We need optimists, workers who know what determination can do. We need believers, people who know what ideals and values can produce. We need voices, voices to shout the encouragement to fight problems, to overcome obstacles.

Where will these voices come from? They can come from you and from me. I cannot speak for you, but one voice is already coming from me. I am willing to speak for America, for the ability of Americans to weather any crisis. I am willing to speak for involvement, for the necessary concern of each citizen in order to have a successful government. If officials are corrupt, say so. If you disagree with policies or programs, speak up. I will care enough to speak for America. But I will never speak so loudly that I forget to listen.

For there have always been voices. In any American library we can find voices. George Washington, Nathan Hale, Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy—all the great speakers of our past are speaking still, speaking to anyone who will listen. They will tell you that America is greater than any adversary, stronger than any opponent. They will tell you that a few determined men can build a reality. They will tell you that no problem is beyond solution. They will tell you that we have had trouble before, but no trouble that Americans, working together, cannot handle. They will speak for America. Listen, and join them.

It is a privilege to have a responsibility to America, a privilege that needs careful attention. We can choose to despair, or we can choose to fight. We can choose to destroy or to build. I have made my choice. My country does not need another disparaging voice. It needs a cheer, a word of encouragement, a suggestion, a vote of confidence. Every American should be involved enough to vote, to honor his country, to feel grateful for the great gift of freedom. But quiet gratitude is not enough. We Americans are marching forward together to a future which offers uncertainty and challenge. Silent soldiers have room for doubt. Raise your voice in support of the country that has nurtured you, in defense of the system that has kept you free, in praise of the spirit that keeps a battered flag waving.

It is my responsibility as a citizen, my privilege as an American to join the voices

of democracy. We will come together in a cry of determination that will carry us forward against my opposition. We have something good; acknowledge it. We have strength and tradition on our side; remember it. Listen to the cheering American voices—those of the past, those of the present, yours, mine, American voices all—listen!

A SALUTE TO WOMEN IN AEROSPACE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to meet and work with a number of the dynamic and dedicated women referred to in this article, who have been aviation pioneers and played a lead role in advancing aviation, aeronautics, and aerospace programs and sciences. Among them are Jean Ross Howard, Isabel Burbess, Sally Murphy, Fran Bera, and Loretta Foy. In the early 1970's it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Governor's Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force for the State of California, on which Loretta Foy was a principal member. The task force was endorsed by then Governor Reagan and superintendent of public instruction, Wilson Riles.

The task force was in existence for 2 years and the 30 members explored all aspects of aerospace education. The 99's and Whirly-Girls were a great asset to the effort. I suggest that my congressional colleagues read the content and recognize this article as a shining example of women's significant contribution in American aerospace. The article follows:

A SALUTE TO WOMEN IN AEROSPACE

The year 1975 has been proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly as International Women's Year. America's year-long "Salute to Women" is outlined in an alphabetical calendar. It began in January with A—for women of achievement in aviation and the aeronautical and aerospace sciences. Thus, this is an appropriate time to recognize women for their significant contributions to the broad field of aerospace.

January 11, 1975, the 40th anniversary of Amelia Earhart's record-breaking flight from Honolulu to Oakland, was selected as the take-off date for the year because Amelia Earhart's deeds and qualities were an inspiration to women everywhere.

"AE", the first woman to fly both the Atlantic and Pacific solo, was the first president of The Ninety-Nines, international organization of licensed women pilots. She was always interested in encouraging other women to fly and to help in their careers.

In 1929, 99 of the then 117 U.S. women pilots met and organized; hence the name. Today there are more than 4000 members in 22 countries. The 99's award seven Amelia Earhart scholarships each year.

Today, women in aerospace:

- push the throttle
- monitor oil spills in the Gulf of Mexico
- help launch satellites
- dust crops
- hunt hurricanes
- make trans-Atlantic delivery flights
- design cockpits

serve as manufacturers and airlines executives

wear Army and Navy aviator wings

establish world aviation records

pilot corporate aircraft

serve as airport/heliport consultants, as FAA flight examiners

control air traffic

direct aviation education programs

work as propulsion, human factors, electrical and design engineers

operate airports/heliports

instruct ground, flight and instrument students

program computers in missile guidance

and control systems, flight simulators

give aerial traffic and weather reports

patrol pipelines

publish and write for aviation newspapers, magazines, books

transport personnel and parts to off-shore rigs

co-pilot commercial airlines

fly rescue missions

teach our youth aerospace subjects

But all this is not really new. In the early days of aviation, women soon proved skilled and qualified as balloon, airplane and helicopter pilots and were accepted and welcomed into the aviation fraternity. Through the years, women have held responsible positions in all segments of aviation. Many have won international recognition for their achievements.

It would be impossible here to report completely and accurately all the many and diversified jobs done by women in aerospace today. Here are just a few that are representative of what women have done, can do, are doing, and given the opportunity, will do, to further advance technological developments for continued U.S. leadership in aerospace.

In 1910, Blanche Scott Stuart, in an unscheduled take-off (strong wind) was the first woman to solo. She went on to become an exhibition pilot. Harriet Quimby, drama critic of *Vogue* magazine, was the first American woman licensed pilot, and the first to fly the English Channel in 1912.

In the 1930's, Helen Richey was the first woman to wear an airline uniform and fly from the right seat. Also in the 30's, the famous Jacqueline Cochran started her record-breaking career (her speed records in the P-51 still holds), and she was the first woman to break the sound barrier.

During World War II she organized the WASPs (Women's Airforce Service Pilots). In the program 1074 women won their wings and flew 60 million miles for the U.S. Army Air Corps.

The first woman to reach toward space was the record-setting balloonist, Jeanette Piccard of Minneapolis, Minn., who in 1934 rose to the height of 57,559 feet. And today Constance Wolf of Blue Bell, Pa., holder of 15 international records, is the leading U.S. woman balloonist.

IN AEROSPACE

It is not possible to recite here the large number of positions held by women throughout all facets of the aerospace industry.

The variety of their important roles includes research and development, engineering, airframe welding, assembly and installation of complicated electronic systems and subsystems, computer programming, designing aircraft components and interiors, selling and flying the finished products, and performing in top management positions.

For example, Mrs. Yvonne Brill invented and patented a design for a "Dual Thrust Level Monopropellant Spacecraft Propulsion System." With RCA since 1966, Mrs. Brill analyzes and designs spacecraft propulsion systems for use in communications, navigation, scientific and meteorological applications.

IN AEROSPACE EDUCATION

One of the greatest contributions of women has been in the field of education where they are teaching aerospace subjects in our educational systems all the way from pre-primary to post-graduate levels. And the 99's are actively involved in supporting aerospace education at all levels of learning.

Elsie W. Adams, Marilyn Link and Jane N. Marshall have received our nation's highest award in aerospace education—the Frank G. Brewer Trophy—awarded annually for the most outstanding contribution in the field of aerospace education.

Dr. Carol St. Cyr served as President of the National Aerospace Education Association from 1972 to 1974.

Both NASA and the FAA, as well as numerous associations have women in their education program offices.

IN GOVERNMENT

As in industry, more women are being named to top positions in government. Aerospace-connected jobs are no exception.

The Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation has women in many key jobs all over the country.

For example, since World War II, women have been manning the control towers at many of our airports. In Hillsboro, Oregon, Delphine Aldecoa is the tower chief. Many women are FAA flight examiners. At FAA headquarters, Mary Jo Oliver is an aviation education specialist. And aeronautical engineer Joan Barriage holds a top post as the Deputy Director of the Office of Environmental Quality.

And at NASA women have important roles in space research. Marjorie Townsend of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center was the first woman to manage a space launch and was the winner of the Federal Women's Award in 1972. Dr. Nancie Lee Bell is a leading microbiologist at NASA's Ames Research Center in California. Dr. Nancy Roman, one of the world's leading astronomers, is program scientist for the astronomical Netherlands satellite and the small astronomy satellite to be launched this year to investigate X-ray sources.

In 1961, Jerrie Cobb was the first U.S. woman to undergo the astronaut tests. She passed, but did not have the test pilot experience required then. For the last eight years Jerrie has been a jungle pilot in South America, flying doctors, missionaries, and medicines to the Indian tribes in Amazonia.

IN THE MILITARY

When the WASPs (Women's Airforce Service Pilots) flew for the Army Air Corps during World War II, they were civilians. In 1973, the Navy for the first time opened aviator training to women and enrolled eight prospective pilots in the first course. They have completed their training and are now assigned to naval air stations around the country. The Army followed in a few months, and now has two qualified women Army Aviator helicopter pilots. The first, Lt. Sally Murphy, now is taking fixed wing training at Ft. Rucker, while the second, Lt. Linda Horan, is at Army Test Pilot School at Ft. Eustis, Va.

IN AIR TRANSPORTATION

Amelia Earhart pioneered many of the air routes flown today and predicted the worldwide use of air transportation. She proved to be right and would have been proud of the women who followed her flight paths and of their role today in this segment of aerospace.

In May 1963, Betty Miller made a record solo flight from California to Australia (the reverse of Miss Earhart's flight), the first such flight by a woman. For this she was awarded the first FAA Exceptional Service Award and personally was congratulated by President Kennedy in the Oval Office. In

May 1964, a Columbus, Ohio, housewife and mother of three, Jerrie Mock, flew her Cessna 180 around the world in 29½ days in history's first globe-circling flight by a woman. She too received the FAA Gold Medal and was congratulated by President Johnson in the Rose Garden.

Both Betty Miller and Jerrie Mock served on the FAA Women's Advisory Committee for Aviation, and both are members of the 99's and The Whirly-Girls, the latter a world-wide organization of women helicopter pilots.

IN COMMUNICATIONS

Tony Page began her aviation news writing career in 1940 by contributing articles to *Southern* (now *Flight*) magazine. She became aviation editor for *The Valley Times* of North Hollywood, Calif., in 1945 while freelance writing for other aviation publications including *Cross Country News*. In 1952 she purchased *Cross Country News* and is now its editor and publisher.

The versatile Valerie Petrie keeps herself busy at *Plane & Pilot* magazine, where she is both managing editor and company pilot.

Page Shamburger's first flying reporter job was for *American Aviation*. Flying in her own plane, she visited 3000 airports. In 1965 she was the first woman to fly on an official Air Force hurricane hunter mission. She is the author of six aviation books.

Jean Blashfield served as Editor-in-Chief of the "Encyclopedia of Aviation and Space Sciences."

There is no doubt that women in aerospace have done and are doing much. It is a field that is expanding for them every day, and in all directions.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Lithuanian-Americans of Buffalo, and throughout the Nation, in commemoration of the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1975.

With the establishment of the republic at the end of World War I, the Lithuanian people enjoyed 20 years of self-determination and personal and religious freedom. This was a period of economic stabilization, and a period of flourishing national culture.

Tragically, Lithuanian independence was short-lived. In 1939, the Soviet Union began its occupation of Lithuania—and continues to this day to occupy and subjugate the Lithuanian State.

Although forcibly incorporated by the Soviet Union, Lithuanians today have no more accepted foreign occupation than they did in 1939. Despite Soviet tactics of terror, of cultural and political manipulation, suppression and propaganda, the Lithuanian national spirit has not been dissolved or diminished—and continues to be a memorial to the dignity of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, as we pause in commemoration of Lithuanian independence, it is incumbent upon us to be vigilant of détente—and to be aware of what détente with the Soviets has not meant to the brave people of Lithuania. It

would be unconscionable and indefensible for America to overlook the realities of suppression in Lithuania that we might be soothed by the peaceful jargon of détente.

In Buffalo, the Knights of Lithuania, and the Lithuanian Club of Buffalo continue to focus attention and action upon the plight of the Lithuanian people. Their efforts on the local level deserve vigorous followup on the congressional level. We cannot forget the brave struggle of the Lithuanian people.

POEM IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Theodore Saffine of Peabody, Mass., has recently sent me a poem written in memory and honor of President Franklin Roosevelt.

As he requested, I would like to insert the poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues and others who have the opportunity to read the RECORD.

The text follows:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Theodore Saffine)

Clouds of want swept o'er a land
Once famed for plenty, joy and health;
Ragged babies cried for food
As parents lost their homes and wealth.

A nation once so grand and proud,
Bowed her head in grief and want,
As misery spread o'er all the land,
And crops and stock were lean and gaunt.

Depression clouds grew ever darker;
Strong minds and hearts must meet the need;

For leadership a nation prayed,
To save the world from crime and greed.

Even the soil seemed bent on ruin;
Sand storms darkened gloomy days.
A situation sad and ominous,
And never a leader to solve new ways!

Here was a tragic problem new,
That threatened to engulf a race.
Surely only a man of magic
Could stem the vicious awful pace.

Questioning eyes looked into tears
Of those whose cheeks were wet with grief,

Pleading, questioning, where the end?
Would some good come to bring relief?

"Experts" brought forth plans amazing:
We must entirely change our ways!
But all their foolish radical ravings
Accomplished only darker days.

Then suddenly a light appeared!
A sunny smile shone through the air,
When came a man of sterling vision,
With firm kind face and graying hair.

In hopeful tones he calmed his people;
He'd do his best to lead them through
The chaos and the deepening labyrinth,
Into sunny pastures new.

"Always must our nation flourish;
Always must our freedom be

Emblematic of our founders—

Those who died for you and me."

Both day and night long hours he labored,
This plucky man at the nation's desk.
Never with bribes were his duties besmirched;
Never a problem but brought forth his best.

Soon plans unheard of in former years,
Came from beneath that Capitol dome;
Plans to re-establish business
And save each workman's humble home.

Soon the hungry were fed and clothed.
Money long hid in the Treasury vault,
Was brought forth to feed hungry mouths.
Some said he was generous to a fault.

"They must be cared for," he firmly reminded,
"For what better cause could money be spent?"

Banks were opened and business resumed;
Into the mountains young men were sent—

To do the work that would keep them clean,
And out of the gutters of city street.
Four years he served and planned great things;

He was saving our nation from defeat!

Like all great men he was cruelly assailed
By cranks who would oust a man of power—

Those morbid fiends from the lower ranks
Envious of each great man of the hour.

But right is might, and the people knew
That they owed their all to this brainful man;

Smiles had taken the place of tears
Long e'er his second term began.

No other man since America's birth
Has coped with such trying and dangerous times,

Restoring laughter to tear dimmed eyes,
As steadily upward prosperity climbs.

Word of his greatness rapidly spread
To other lands where they praise his name,
And tell how he avoided the fall of a nation,
And how he merits the highest acclaim.

Beloved by men the world around,
From north to south, and east to west,
A whole world proudly, fondly vows
Forever will his name be blest!

A WARNING TO HEED

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, as all independent Americans should, the Baltimore News American has taken note of the concern expressed by the Director of the CIA, Mr. William E. Colby, regarding the pending congressional investigations of his and other intelligence agencies. It is my hope that a Congress that was willing to abolish its own investigative unit aimed at subversion, the House Committee on Internal Security, will not now conduct a witch hunt against the agencies of Government who are charged with protecting our Nation.

I include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

A WARNING TO HEED

William E. Colby, director of the beleaguered Central Intelligence Agency, last week gave Congress a grim warning of the damage already done to national security operations by what he called "exaggerated" press alle-

March 4, 1975

gations—and the potential future damage inherent in pending probes by publicity-seeking Washington lawmakers.

Both the Senate and the House, heavily dominated by the Democratic party, have established Watergate-type select committees soon to begin quasi-public investigations of the CIA, the FBI and all other hush-hush government agencies. With revealing significance, the House committee has allotted only three of its 10 seats to Republicans.

In rare public testimony before a House Appropriations sub-committee last Thursday, Mr. Colby undertook to deny charges in the New York Times and elsewhere that the CIA conducted "massive illegal domestic intelligence operations." Admitting that some minor stretching of the CIA charter may have occurred in pursuing possible foreign links to American dissidents, Mr. Colby nevertheless insisted:

"It was neither massive, illegal nor (fundamentally) domestic, as charged. All our operations were made at presidential directive and under authority of the National Security Act."

This admittedly real consideration, he went on, was negligible when compared with the harm done to national security operations by what he termed "hysterical" charges against the agency.

Already, he said, CIA relations with intelligence groups in allied nations have been jeopardized, the very lives of American spies on dangerous missions abroad have been imperiled, and CIA morale in general has been lowered dangerously.

"These last two months have placed American intelligence in danger," Mr. Colby said. "Exaggeration and misrepresentations of CIA activities do irreparable harm to our intelligence apparatus. If carried to the extreme, (they) would blindfold our country as it looks ahead."

What the director clearly suggested was that the forthcoming select committee probes, with their built-in danger of private-session leaks, are a dandy way of serving the curiosity of Moscow spies far more than the interests of the American people. In a terribly competitive, war-threatened world, even democracies are obliged to have self-protective secrets—or else.

Like CIA Director Colby, we view the impending Senate and House inquiries with both resignation and trepidation. Congress has a perfect right to pursue the planned probes—which incidentally are supposed to go on quietly all the time as part of its budget control responsibility. It is the specter of politics vs. security which is so alarming.

Sometimes—when especially discouraged—it is possible to view some of the decisions of our national legislators as not only self-serving but self-defeating. We fear that the hippodrome probes of national security agencies now looming may well fall into both categories.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Cooper T. Holt, executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Nancy Catherine Haga, Route 3, Box 212, Independence, Va., was the winning speech contestant from the Commonwealth of Virginia in the national Voice of Democracy Contest, conducted an-

nually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

I am further informed that the winning contestants from each State will be brought to Washington, D.C., for the final national judging as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The prize for the national winner is a \$10,000 scholarship. The winning contestants from each State will be further honored on the evening of March 11, 1975, from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual congressional dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include Miss Haga's winning speech in the RECORD, so that each Member of Congress and the citizens of the Nation might have the benefit of the thoughts of a young 17-year-old Virginia lady:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

As a part of growing and learning, it has become a compulsory rule to look back at the pages in our nation's history. If, per chance, what we see, read, and hear is beginning to get a little trite, then probably we are missing an important revelation that glares at us from every page.

Can it be, fellow citizen, that as we enjoy the fruit handed down by those before us, we neglect to plant seeds of our own?

I am told often of the Revolution; of the struggles of our forefathers to obtain certain God-given rights of freedom—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—so that future generations, You and I, would never be deprived of them. I read of how a group of courageous, freedom-loving men boldly set down a list of signatures on a document which would officially grant you and me the freedom to enjoy these same rights. Determination and responsibility kept them going, even as they faced possible execution. I have looked, misty-eyed, at long, innumerable rows of white crosses; the only recognition that thousands upon thousands of young men have gained for the scourge and horror of world war. Their names didn't make it to the history books because their responsibilities as citizens remained far more supreme. Then, perhaps somewhat less remote to my lifetime, I have known the irrational assassination of a few of America's great leaders like Kennedy and King. These men were also willing to take a risk for their nation, dying in the midst of mighty efforts and not in the cozy little rut in which too many Americans are content to live out their lives.

We as citizens find it far easier to take our gift of liberty for granted than to remember how and from whom they were granted. It seems that few of us live each day thinking desperate, long-ranged thoughts about how we will live, or die if need be, to keep America the superior nation that she is for our children who will follow us. Some regard it as unnecessary.

Ah, but it is necessary. We must strive to keep within us from day to day, the truthful conviction of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower—

"Freedom from fear and injustice and oppression will be ours only in the measure that men who value such freedom are ready to sustain its possession—to defend it against every thrust from within or without."

It is my responsibility to nurture these blessings of freedom at all costs while encouraging others to do the same. For any democracy composed of persons who value this freedom will remain a working democracy. For this reason we must open the eyes of those who don't value it. We can achieve this only by living up to our responsibilities,

for it is impossible to ignite fever in another man's soul if we don't have it in our own.

I can begin by taking an active, effective part in this ingenious government, tackling first the startling fact that roughly 40% of my nation fails to vote each year. Apathy is our deadliest enemy for in the words of Woodrow Wilson—

"Freedom exists only where the people take care of the government."

In a government of, for, and by the people, both the problems and the remedies lie strictly with you and me and our own God-given strengths. As long as we retain the ability to come to grips with this fact, we will never fall from within because of disillusionment, immorality, lack of faith, or a more attractive form of power that lies beyond our borders. Likewise, with such vast inner strength, we can never be vulnerable to attacks from without. General Douglas McArthur once said—

"The inescapable price of liberty is the ability to preserve it from destruction."

So long as you and I stand by this moral obligation, whatever duty demands, we can live up to the title, "Citizens of America."

THE RECORD OF THE WPA AND OTHER NEW DEAL PROGRAMS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent months as our national economic crisis has rapidly worsened there have been more and more references to various of the depression-era economic recovery programs, especially the Works Progress Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and others. I have asked the Library of Congress Research Service to do a short study of some of the accomplishments of these programs, which I believe is deserving of the Members' attention. The study follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1975.

To: The Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins.
Attention: Gilbert Vigil.

From: Peter B. Sheridan, Analyst, Government and General Research Division (Kenneth E. Gray, Chief).

Subject: Background information on the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Public Works Administration, the Works Progress (and Work Projects) Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In response to your inquiry of January 28, 1975, concerning the establishment and record of the above-mentioned agencies, I submit, attached hereto, a brief analysis of the origins, objectives, and accomplishments of such agencies.

The four New Deal agencies (CCC, PWA, WPA, and NYA) described in the attached report had their origins in Franklin D. Roosevelt's attempts to alleviate the desperate condition of an estimated 15,000,000 unemployed. These four "alphabetical" agencies constituted a massive attack on the problems of unemployment caused by the Great Depression beginning in 1929 and are considered prime examples of the relief and recovery measures of Roosevelt's New Deal.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) was created in the last year of the

Hoover Administration and originally possessed a rather limited range of authority. This was broadened considerably when Roosevelt became President.

THE ORIGINS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CCC, PWA, WPA, NYA, AND THE RFC

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC)

The history of the Civilian Conservation Corps falls into three periods. The first period was initiated by the Emergency Conservation Act of 1933. This Act, supplemented by Executive Order 6101, authorized the establishment of camps where employment and training was provided for youthful unemployed citizens of the United States. The second period was initiated by the Act of June 28, 1937. This Act formally established the Civilian Conservation Corps as a definite agency within the governmental framework, and gave legal recognition to the title which long had been in use. The third period began on July 1, 1939, when the Civilian Conservation Corps, by the Act of April 3, 1939 known as the Reorganization Act of 1939, was transferred by the President to the Federal Security Agency. This transfer did not change the administrative set-up of the Corps, but during this period more attention was directed to the national defense program. Vocational training for defense industry and military drill for all enrollees were initiated in this third period. In May, 1940, the Civilian Conservation Corps began converting to defense work on military reservations and forest protection. The Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1943 provided for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps not later than June 30, 1943.

The objectives of the Civilian Conservation Corps were to provide the unemployed work of a public nature in the construction, maintenance, and conduct of programs of reforestation, the prevention of forest fires, floods, and soil erosion, the control of plant pests and from attacks by insects and tree diseases; and by mosquito control helped stamp out malaria. They also helped control predatory animals and rodents on nearly 40 million acres of range lands. The Civilian Conservation Corps added more than 17 million acres of forest land; and it has been estimated that of all the forest planting, public and private, in the history of the nation, more than half was done by the Corps.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION (PWA)

The National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 provided for the creation of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. It was not until July, 1939 that the agency became officially designated as the Public Works Administration. Reorganization Plan 1, which became effective on July 1, 1939, consolidated the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works into the Federal Works Agency to be administered as the Public Works Administration. PWA was scheduled to expire several times but was extended by various appropriations. The Independent Office Appropriation Act for fiscal 1943 extended the Public Works Administration to June 30, 1943. By Executive Order 9357, of June 30, 1943, the PWA's functions were transferred to the office of the Federal Works Administration. This agency was abolished by an act approved June 30, 1949, and its functions transferred to the General Services Administration.

The objectives of the PWA were to promote and stabilize employment and purchasing power by the encouragement of construction of useful public works projects through loans and/or grants to non-Federal public bodies and, to a limited extent, by financing construction of Federal projects. The PWA was authorized to develop long-range plans for a comprehensive program of public works projects which included the

construction, repair and improvement of highways, parkways, public buildings, and other facilities.

Almost every conceivable type of public works projects was embraced by PWA's activities. PWA built bridges, tunnels, harbors, involved itself in the construction of naval vessels, combat planes, and more than fifty military airports.

The PWA made grants and loans to state and local governments for numerous construction projects including school and college buildings and libraries. From 1933 to 1939, the PWA helped construct more than 70% of the country's new school buildings, 65% of its courthouses, city halls, and sewage plants, and 35% of its hospitals and public health facilities.

WORKS PROGRESS (AND WORK PROJECTS) ADMINISTRATION (WPA)

The Works Progress Administration was created by Executive Order 7034 of May 6, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and continued by subsequent yearly Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts. The name was changed to the Work Projects Administration on July 1, 1939 by Reorganization Plan 1 which provided for the consolidation of the Works Progress Administration into the Federal Works Agency.

With the approach of World War II, the WPA aided the defense effort by engaging in construction at various military installations. The war brought increased employment and in a letter from the President to the Federal Works Administration, December 4, 1942, the liquidation of the program was authorized. On June 30, 1943 the agency was terminated.

The general objective of the WPA was to operate a program of useful public works projects, and to aid employable needy persons by providing work on such projects.

In its eight years of operation the WPA gave work to more than eight million unemployed in a sometimes bewildering variety of projects. Millions were spent on such projects as 600,000 miles of highways, 125,000 public buildings, 78,000 bridges, 8,000 parks, 850 airport landing fields, 5,900 school buildings, and nearly 13,000 playgrounds. The WPA built or improved more than 2,500 hospitals.

Other activities of the WPA included reforestation projects and the construction of dams and dikes as a measure of flood control.

A novel feature of the WPA was the creation of a Federal Arts, Writers', and Theater Program. This gave employment to thousands of writers, artists, and musicians. The Writers' Project, for example, prepared about a thousand publications, including fifty-one state and territorial guides, some thirty city guides, twenty regional guides, and several special studies. The Federal Theater Project presented plays to many people who had never seen a theatrical production, and the artists produced paintings, sculptures, and more than 2,500 murals in public buildings throughout the nation.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION (NYA)

The National Youth Administration was established within the Works Progress Administration by Executive Order 7086 of June 26, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (48 Stat. 115). Effective July 1, 1939, the NYA was transferred by Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Federal Security Agency (later reorganized into the Department of Health, Education and Welfare). By Executive Order 9247 of Sept. 17, 1942, the NYA was transferred to the War Manpower Commission where it functioned within the Bureau of Training. The NYA was dissolved by an Act of July 12, 1943, having terminated its war production projects and liquidated its holdings.

The major objectives of the National Youth Administration were as follows:

1. To provide funds for the part-time

employment of needy school, college, and graduate students between 16 and 25 years of age so that they could continue their education.

2. To provide funds for the part-time employment on work projects of young persons, chiefly from relief families, between 18 and 25 years of age. The projects were designed not only to give these young people valuable work experience, but also to benefit youth generally and the communities in which they lived.

3. To encourage the establishment of job training, counseling, and placement services for youth.

4. To encourage the development and extension of constructive leisure-time activities.

The National Youth Administration was in operation eight years (1935-1943). In that time, a total of \$662,300,000 was expended, of which \$467,500,000 for the school work program. The NYA gave part-time employment to more than 600,000 college students and to more than one and half million high school students. During the same period the NYA aided over 2.6 million jobless youths (45% female) who were not in school. Many of these received vocational training in NYA workshops.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (RFC)

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created by special Act of Congress on January 22, 1932. The RFC was organized and began operations on February 2, 1932. Extended several times, the liquidation of the RFC was provided for by an Act of July 30, 1953. This Act terminated the lending powers of the RFC effective September 28, 1953 and liquidation of the Corporation's assets began at that time. The same Act also created the Small Business Administration while providing for the continuation of the RFC until June 30, 1954. Thereafter, in furthering the liquidation process, the Secretary of the Treasury succeeded to and exercised all powers, duties, and authority previously lodged in the Administrator of the RFC. Effective June 30, 1957, the RFC was abolished and its remaining functions transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the General Services Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of the Treasury.

Broadly stated, the object of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was to aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining economic stability of the country, and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production.

The RFC act was passed by a House controlled by the Democrats and a Senate run by a coalition of Democrats and Republican progressives. The measure was adopted by President Hoover with more than a little reluctance.

Under President Hoover, the RFC was authorized to lend money to banks, railroads, and other institutions. When Roosevelt put Jesse Jones, a Texas banker, at the head of the RFC it became a vastly different institution. Among the largest and most complex of all Federal lending agencies, the RFC became the banker for many of the new relief and recovery agencies. Loans were made for many purposes, including construction of school buildings, teachers' salary payments, and refinancing of indebtedness incurred for educational purposes.

During its twenty-one years and eight months of operation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made some 240,000 loans involving twelve billion dollars. Aside from its peacetime activities, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under legislation in 1940 and 1950, assumed large military responsibilities, e.g., purchases of strategic items, financing war production facilities, and administration of the war damage insurance program.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the House commemorated the 57th anniversary of Lithuanian independence by placing appropriate remarks in the RECORD.

I am pleased to insert at this time a resolution that was adopted by the Lithuanian-Americans of the Chicago Western Suburbs in Lemont, Ill., which calls for the reaffirmation of U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forceful annexation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia.

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of the Chicago Western Suburbs at a meeting held on February 9, 1975, commemorating the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918, and the 724th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian Kingdom in 1251, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in 1918 the Republic of Lithuania was established by the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all sovereign rights and claims by Russia over Lithuanian soil and her people; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1940 Lithuania was a fully independent and sovereign nation, a member of the League of Nations, and a signatory of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union during June 15-17, 1940, invaded and occupied Lithuania by overwhelming force of arms, and subsequently, forcibly annexed the Lithuanian Nation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has systematically conducted a policy of colonization, ethnic dilution and Russification within Lithuania; and

Whereas the United States Government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania to this very day are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime in seeking political and religious freedom, as demonstrated by the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, and the subsequent demonstration of thousands of young Lithuanians, and the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations, and most recently untold numbers of Lithuanians arrested and imprisoned for the publication and distribution of "The Chronical of the Lithuanian Catholic Church"; and

Whereas the 89th U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurring Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the question of the Baltic Nations and other international forums, focusing attention on the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that we, Lithuanian-Americans will urge the President of the United States, Members of Congress, and the United States

Department of State to publicly reaffirm the United States Policy of non-recognition of the forceful annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, and to maintain that policy during all negotiations with the Soviet Union, especially, those concerned with the new Detente policy; and further

Resolved, to request the President of the United States to vigorously implement House Concurring Resolution 416 to the fullest extent.

KAZYS LAUKAITIS,

President.

VYTAUTAS KAMANTAS,

Secretary.

WHY INDEXED TAX SYSTEMS PROVIDE THE NEEDED FRAME OF REFERENCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William J. Fellner, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and previously an opponent of indexation for Federal taxes and obligations, came out in strong support of this proposal, in a recent speech delivered in King's Point, N.Y. On behalf of my colleagues and myself who have worked for many months now on enacting legislation, I welcome his conversion and support, and I wish to share some of the pertinent observations made by Professor Fellner in his address.

This year's annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers reveals that the 1974 inflation rate of 11 percent caused personal income tax payments to rise by \$8 billion. Mr. Fellner asserted that this increase is directly attributable to the relocation of taxpayers' dollar income into new, distorted taxable income levels. He points out:

In any event, the \$8 billion estimate for 1974 is based on the assumption that the distorting effect of inflation results exclusively from the relocation of taxpayers from non-taxable into taxable brackets, and from lower to higher brackets, because their money incomes reflect an inflationary trend which their real incomes, of course, do not display.

Dr. Fellner proceeds with considerable detail to advance the need for complete tax indexation since the corporate tax structure also allows inflation to deprive corporate taxpayers of more of their real incomes than Congress intended. Indeed, private enterprise would have been saved nearly \$20 billion in 1974 alone had no taxes been levied on inflationary gains, strictly on corporate taxpayers.

Therefore, in 1974, the cost of non-indexed, progressive taxation to the Nation's taxpayers was almost \$30 billion. Conversely, Dr. Fellner continued:

I have concluded that tax indexation such as would have excluded the inflationary distortions developing during 1974 would have led to a reduction of tax payments by up to \$30 billion in that year.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for ways to relieve recessionary pressures, while simultaneously combating inflationary elements which removed many

natural economic stabilizers, primarily through long-range, comprehensive tax reforms. I invite my colleagues in Congress to join Dr. Fellner in support of the true and effective reforms offered by complete indexation of the Federal tax structure.

The entire text of Dr. Fellner's speech before the Civil Service Commission on February 13, 1975, and Hobart Rowan's article of February 14, 1975, published in the Washington Post follow:

WHY INDEXED TAX SYSTEMS PROVIDE THE NEEDED FRAME OF REFERENCE

(By Dr. William J. Fellner)

Having served on the Council of Economic Advisers since the Fall of 1973, I am about to return to my earlier work and will continue to be engaged in economic research. Let me make a few observations about one of the several problems I take along with me for further thinking and exploration.

The distorting effect of inflation on the tax structure has developed into a very disturbing problem, and it is one to which more attention needs to be paid as we go along. The only systematic way of gradually removing these distortions would be to use an indexed tax system as the point of departure for any tax-rate adjustments we may wish to make in the future.

Indexing the tax-structure means not allowing taxpayers to move from nontaxable into taxable brackets, or from lower into higher tax brackets, as a result of increases in money incomes that reflect merely the rate of inflation since some base year; and indexation exempts from taxation any revaluation of an unchanging stock of assets to the extent that the revaluation merely reflects the inflation rate. A number of technical decisions would have to be made to arrive at a firm decision as to what precisely the shape of the 1974 tax structure would have been if it had been indexed so as to be influenced neither by the tax-bracket consequences of the inflation rate from, say, 1973 to 1974 nor by 1974 asset-revaluations expressing merely the general rate of inflation. But I would expect reasonable expectations to be able to agree on acceptable procedures in this regard, though the question of what deviations of the actual tax structure from an indexed structure so derived would be considered most desirable would, of course, remain a matter of personal judgment.

In the 1975 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers it was estimated that in 1974 an 11 percent inflation rate has increased personal tax payments by at least \$8 billion. This is a rough "measure" of distortion in one area of taxation, as compared to keeping the tax structure indexed from 1973 on. The further one wanted to go back into the past in setting the base year the more difficult would it become to measure the various distortions, because of earlier tax-rate adjustments and because it is impossible to tell to what extent the legislators were at that time influenced by the post-1965 inflationary trend. In any event the \$8 billion estimate for 1974 is based on the assumption that the distorting effect of inflation results exclusively from the relocation of taxpayers from non-taxable into taxable brackets, and from lower to higher tax brackets, because their money incomes reflect an inflationary trend which their real incomes, of course, do not display. This however, for reasons already hinted at and to be explained in a moment, does not take care of the inflationary tax distortions suffered by those earning interest or a yield from assets of any sort.

Recipients of interest are not freed from the distorting effects of inflation if after, say, a 10 percent general price increase and a 10 percent increase of their money income

they are kept in an unchanging tax bracket. The distortion would be eliminated for them only if we recognized also that up to a 10 percent nominal rate of interest they earned no positive real income that is, by deducting from their money-interest income a 10 percent rate allowance for maintaining the real value of their savings.

The reason why it might have been confusing simply to merge this aspect of the tax-distortion problem with the usual problem of removing distortions from the personal tax structure is that the specific problem of interest-recipients ties in quite closely with the distortions inflation has caused in the area of corporate taxation. Insofar as corporations use the so-called FIFO—first in, first out—method of inventory valuation, they are taxed on the current-dollar gains developing when they replace their inventories at higher prices, and in recent times these gains—which are locked in for corporations not reducing their inventories—have reflected to a large extent the general inflationary trend. Moreover, corporations are required to use the historical cost of acquisition of their plant and equipment as the basis for depreciation—in this regard they the FIFO-LIFO inventory valuation option—and, whenever they replace their fixed capital at inflated prices, the difference between the replacement cost and the historical cost of acquisition also shows as a taxable gain in terms of current dollars. This too is a locked-in gain for going enterprises and reflects very largely the inflationary general price trend. If no taxes had been levied on these two types of inflationary gain this would have lowered tax collections significantly—in 1974 by an amount in the neighborhood of \$20 billion. The precise figure depends on what measure of inflation we use, but it would be difficult to arrive at an estimate of less than \$15 billion for the reduction of the tax burden corresponding to the exclusion of such inflationary revaluation gains from the tax base. Most of the inflationary nominal gain—the large inventory component—must have developed as a result of steep inflation during very recent time spans, some of it—the fixed equipment component—as a result of inflation over a long period. This problem of corporate taxation raises questions intimately connected with the taxation of interest-income that is merely “nominal” rather than “real”.

The link is close because while a substantial part of the inflationary inventory and fixed-capital revaluation gains, reflecting current inflation trends, shows in taxable corporate book profits, another part of considerable size shows in the taxable income of creditors who have contributed to financing the acquisition of inventories and of fixed capital. In an indexed tax and accounting system corporations and enterprises in general would, on the one hand, not include into their tax base the inflationary revaluation gains to which I have referred; on the other hand, when computing their taxable profits they would deduct as interest cost merely the real interest they are paying to their creditors, that is, they would deduct not all money interest but merely the difference between money interest and the equivalent of the inflation rate. Interest recipients of all categories, including owners of savings deposits, would in turn be taxed only on the “real” component of their interest-income (where there is such a component). The procedure so described would imply, among other things, a rechanneling from corporations to their creditors that part of the tax savings which, while conveyed to the corporations, are to be imputed to the creditors because at present taxable inflationary revaluation gains reflect themselves in part in the creditors’ taxable interest incomes rather than in the taxable income of the borrower. However the tax burden of interest-recipients would become reduced below what is

involved in the rechanneling of part of the tax-saving from the corporations to creditors, since not all taxable interest income derives from corporate borrowing.

Excluding recent inflationary distortions through indexation for personal incomes in general, for interest-income (whether personal or other) in particular, and also for business profits, would probably have brought about a larger loss in fiscal revenue than will be caused by the rather fortuitous tax-rate reductions on money incomes that might take place in reality. I am planning to explore the matter systematically and should not speak as if I had already completed a piece of systematic research on the subject but in a general way I did look into the available data, and as yet quite tentatively I have concluded that tax indexation such as would have excluded the inflationary distortions developing during 1974 would have led to a reduction of tax payments by up to \$30 billion in that year. I am not urging a corresponding enlargement of the tax cuts planned at present but I am urging that we explore thoroughly the properties of an indexed tax structure and that we use the results as our frame of reference when thinking about tax adjustments.

At present we are determined to reduce effective tax rates on money incomes, in large part because in the current recession automatic stabilizers are put out of commission by the inflationary process. At other times we may want to reduce effect rates for other reasons which are nevertheless likely to have to do with a reduced but continued rise of the general price level. There will also be times in our future history in which we will want to raise tax rates. In all these cases an orderly decisionmaking process requires that we should have a frame of reference in relation to which we can justify what we are proposing to do. We should know what the characteristics of our tax structure would be after exclusion of the recent inflationary effects and we should be able to explain and justify why we propose to change that structure whenever we wish to do so. A badly inflation-ridden tax structure does not provide the needed frame of reference. To continue using such a structure as a frame of reference for making adjustment “by feel” would be bad practice.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1975]

INDEXED TAX STRUCTURE ADVOCATED BY FELLNER

(By Hobart Rowen)

A member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers said yesterday that “inflationary distortions” had boosted 1974 tax payments by about \$30 billion.

William J. Fellner, in a speech to a Civil Service Commission audience in Kings Point, N.Y., strongly advocated an indexed tax structure—automatic adjustments of the tax rates to offset the effects of inflation—to take care of this problem.

Fellner is scheduled to resign shortly to return to his post as resident scholar of the American Enterprise Institute in Washington. A text of his speech was released here.

Increasing attention has been given recently to the impact of inflation on the tax structure. The annual report of the CEA noted that inflation has been pushing individuals into higher tax brackets, “causing a significant transfer of real income from individuals to the government . . .”

And a study published last week by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress noted that higher taxes had caused an even greater burden to many families than inflated food or transportation costs.

Fellner's estimate of \$30 billion as the cost of inflation in terms of higher tax obligations is made up of about \$8 billion drained from individuals, and approximately another \$20 billion from corporations.

The CEA report cited the following example to show the tax effects of inflation on a family of four that filed a joint return of \$10,000 in 1972, paying federal taxes of \$905 (taking standard non-itemized deductions).

The same family in 1975, with a 30 per cent increase in income to \$13,000, matching a 30 per cent increase in prices over the period, would pay \$1,391 in taxes. In this case, despite the 30 per cent increase in money income, the real after-tax income would drop almost 2 per cent in 3 years, the CEA said.

Under an indexed tax system, individuals would not move into higher brackets, Fellner said, “as a result of increases in money incomes that reflect merely the rate of inflation since some base year.”

Corporations would be exempt from including in their taxable income “any revaluation of an unchanging stock of assets to the extent that the revaluation merely reflects the inflation rate.”

Fellner pointed out that indexation of personal income doesn't take care of the problem suffered by those whose interest return on investments is wiped out or reduced by inflation.

He gave as an example a person whose investment income increases 10 per cent while prices are rising 10 per cent, and who thus remains in an unchanged tax bracket.

In such a case, Fellner said, the loss could be compensated by deducting from money-interest income “a 10 per cent rate allowance for maintaining the real value of their savings.”

But the question of shifting the taxation of interest income from “nominal” or money value, to “real” income, Fellner said, is intimately connected with corporation taxation.

In a fully indexed tax and accounting system, he observed, corporations could report real rather than inflationary profits. But in computing their taxable profits, “they would deduct as interest cost merely the real interest they are paying their creditors . . .”

“Interest recipients of all categories, including owners of savings deposits, would in turn be taxed only on the ‘real’ component of their interest-income, when there is such a component.”

The Ford Administration has made no formal proposals for indexation. The CEA report said that “truly comprehensive indexing is not feasible immediately”, although the practice is spreading through various kinds of automatic adjustments and wage escalators.

Fellner said he was not recommending a further tax cut of \$30 billion on top of the \$16 billion already recommended by the Administration, but urged a thorough study of indexing, to be used “as our frame of reference when thinking about tax adjustments.”

THE HAZARDS OF LIQUID NATURAL GAS IN POPULATED AREAS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, to see that many of my constituents from several communities of the 14th Congressional District could have their views expressed, I made a statement before the Federal Power Commission. That statement dealt with the storage and transportation of liquid natural gas in the New York City area.

This topic is of primary concern to me and many citizens, whose lives are threatened daily by this hazardous material.

It is my hope that something tangible will come from those hearings and I submit my statement to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with that hope in mind:

STATEMENT BY HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND
BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
MARCH 3, 1975

Mr. Chairman: I am Fred Richmond, Congressman from the 14th Congressional District of New York. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to address this Commission.

The storage and transportation of Liquid Natural Gas is of particular interest to me because the safety and well-being of many of my constituents depends upon the regulations regarding this hazardous material.

My district constitutes an area of Brooklyn which borders segments of the New York waterfront. The area encompassed by the district lines is approximately seven square miles. As you can clearly see, there are several hundred thousand citizens within a very confined section of land. Located within the district in Greenpoint, there are two liquid natural gas storage tanks which are placed within a mixed industrial residential area.

This placement has been a continuing fear for the thousands of residents whose homes encompass this potential disaster area. Although these tanks have been certified by authorities to be safe and not potentially dangerous, they still remain a haunting realization for thousands of citizens.

There are other flammable materials stored near these tanks such as gas and oil, as well as lumber. If there was a fire originating from any one of these substances, the outcome could be catastrophic. We all realize the potential danger and flammability of each of these materials, but have we considered what developments could occur if such a fire took place within the questionable area? This is a situation which has caused discomfort and fear for a number of years. It is a situation which has not corrected itself and one which is not acceptable to my constituents or to me.

The merits for using liquid natural gas cannot be disputed. It is an efficient form of energy which can be used without substantial environmental impact. Its use in residential areas has proven to be most helpful in combating the pollution caused by less environmentally sound substances such as coal and other fuels. During these times of increased energy demands, the need for this type of efficiency cannot be neglected. With the availability of energy becoming less frequent and the cost forever rising, it is necessary for us to utilize energy sources. My concern actually does not lie with the usage of liquid natural gas, but rather the placement of storage tanks and the movement to these tanks.

In order to transfer this highly hazardous material to areas of New York where liquid natural gas is stored, barges and tankers are utilized. The transfer of liquid natural gas from the Staten Island Terminal to Brooklyn is done primarily by barges. These marine transports travel down the East River, up Newtown Creek and finally reach the Brooklyn Terminal. Although the Coast Guard has assured me that this movement is strictly regulated, the danger involved cannot be overlooked.

I am strongly opposed to the transportation and storage of liquid natural gas in New York City. The communities of Brooklyn Heights, Fort Greene, Williamsburg, Northside and Greenpoint, which are a part of the 14th Congressional District, have become unwilling participants in a game of high stakes which if lost could have devastating effects upon these constituents. When liquid natural gas is transferred, it is moved along the waters of these communities and presents a danger of uncomprehensible consequences.

In any major collision, grounding or spillage, there would be a whole range of hazards, the exact sequence of which is hard to predict. It is necessary to point out what might happen following a harbor accident involving liquid natural gas. The two basic assumptions following a gas release would be an immediate fire or the creation of highly flammable vapor clouds.

The New York City Fire Department says: "The proposal to transfer liquid natural gas by barge from Staten Island across the harbor and through Hell Gate in the East River poses substantial risks to public safety in the view of the City of New York."

We in New York are particularly alarmed because the New York City Fire Department has declared recent policies to be unsafe.

The Fire Department in its history of public service has always been accurate in evaluation of potentially hazardous situations.

They said the world trade center would not meet safety standards when being built. Because it was outside their authority they could not do anything about it. The recent fire at the world trade center possessed the gravest fear and dangers that were recently exploited in the movie "Towering Inferno." If that building had been built to meet New York City Fire Department standards, this might never have occurred.

I hope that we will be more attentive to the New York City Fire Department. They have not cried wolf in the past and I hope this commission very carefully considers their views.

I am calling on the Federal Power Commission to order an immediate moratorium on the storage and transportation of liquid natural gas in New York City until studies effectively show evaluate how liquid natural gas can be stored and transferred in the safest manner and with minimal risks to human safety possible.

I believe it should be possible to locate sites along our coast where modern and safe liquid natural gas facilities could be built yet which do not threaten any significant number of people with the disastrous consequences I have described. It may be that these facilities might be somewhat more expensive than those that have already been built in the heart of our major metropolitan areas, but if so, it would be a worthwhile investment in protecting the public from the hazards of liquid natural gas.

RAISING THE INCOMES OF OLDER AMERICANS

HON. KENNETH L. HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced legislation to amend title II of the Social Security Act, raising the amount of outside income a person may earn while receiving Social Security benefits to \$3,600 from the present \$2,520.

Thirty-six of our colleagues are co-sponsoring this bill with me. These Members all agree that something must be done to raise the income of our older citizens. They also agree that Congress must act responsibly to balance the needs of all our citizens at a time of economic instability.

However, Mr. Speaker, these colleagues represent only a small portion of the Members who feel that a change in the outside income limitation is necessary. Members of my staff made calls to other

offices last week and found almost unanimous support for an increase in the limitation. Many House Members are on other bills to raise the limitation or do away with it entirely.

Considering the support for this legislation in the 94th Congress, much of which is continued from the 93d, I feel this is the year Congress will act for older citizens. Americans living on fixed incomes—incomes held down by the social security earnings limitation—cannot maintain a decent standard of living with today's inflation. Our bill will allow these citizens to earn an additional \$90 a month, enough to make ends meet.

Admittedly, the entire social security system is in trouble. The total financing of the program must be seriously reviewed with an eye toward making the system self-sufficient. But we cannot tell these older citizens, who have contributed so much to our Nation, to hold their bills until such a review is completed.

To raise the limitation by even the moderate amount of \$1,080 is a costly proposition. Many persons who receive little or no benefits now would be eligible for full benefits. Raising the limitation to \$3,600 will cost approximately \$300 million a year. However, since removing the limitation entirely would cost taxpayers nearly \$4.5 billion annually, the cost of raising it to \$3,600 is comparatively small.

The increase which we propose in our bill will affect an estimated 1,000,000 persons over age 65. Mr. Speaker, we will be doing a great service to these persons who so desperately need the assistance.

More than 35 percent of our older citizens nationwide have incomes below the poverty level. In my district, the Fifth District of South Carolina, nearly 40 percent of the older citizens live below the poverty level.

With the advances in medicine of recent years, Americans are living longer. For example, while the overall population of South Carolina has increased by 6.6 percent since 1960, the increase in the group of citizens 65 and older has increased by about 14 percent. If the Federal Government continues to hold their incomes at substandard levels through the social security income limitation, we will be creating the largest single group of poor people with a program designed for their old age security.

There is tremendous pressure on this Congress to hold down Federal spending. Mr. Speaker, we cannot be so bound and blinded by this budgetary obligation that we hold people in poverty to hold the budget in check.

The American people are looking to Congress for responsible economic leadership. We are moving ahead in all areas to show the American people that we are capable of providing that leadership. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the exigencies of the present economic situation dictate that we raise the outside income limitation for social security recipients this year. I hope that other Members of Congress will see the moderate rise that we have proposed as a responsible figure in a year of great fiscal constraint.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request early and careful consideration of this

bill, which simply allows our older citizens to meet the increased cost of living through the exertion of their own efforts.

INDIAN JURISDICTION

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Indian jurisdiction is one which effects not only my State of South Dakota but many other Western States. I am proud to say that the South Dakota State Legislature and Governor Kneip are in the vanguard of those States trying to work out this complex problem. I am pleased to share with my colleagues an article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader of February 26, 1975, describing the deliberate and conscientious efforts being made by Governor Kneip and the South Dakota State Legislature. The article follows:

South Dakota legislators would do well to heed Governor Richard Kneip's observation that there was no need to hurry a resolution seeking congressional action to help South Dakota's Indian jurisdictional and other problems.

There was a push in the legislature last week to complete work on the resolution so it could be delivered to a congressional subcommittee in Washington Monday.

Kneip pointed out that that subcommittee meeting dealt only with law enforcement, and South Dakota's contemplated resolution touches on a variety of issues involving jurisdiction problems between Indians and non-Indians.

When Governor Kneip started his new term in January, he called upon South Dakotans to make the effort to develop better relations between whites and Indians. Truly, this is South Dakota's most urgent and pressing human problem.

Kneip in his inaugural message challenged South Dakotans to come up with a model solution for problems that have been points of contention between the Indians and the state's other citizens for years. Congress is necessarily involved, because many of the problems stem from federal mishandling of native Americans and their status since territorial days.

It would be a credit to all South Dakotans if work by the legislature, by the Indians and their tribal organizations and by Congress resulted in a better day for the 35,000 or more Indians who call South Dakota home. It is a challenge for which all citizens should attempt to work out solutions.

It is great to call for friendly relations on an international scale. It is much harder for everyone to make things work at home.

A good time to start on making things work at home is the forthcoming public hearing in Pierre Thursday night on the resolution to Congress. Indian leaders said they don't agree with the wording of the resolution—and accused lawmakers of trying to pass it without consulting them. Kneip pointed to the possibility that the hearing would become emotional. "I hope this does not happen. It is an important issue and one we should address . . ." he said.

When the resolution goes to Washington, it should reflect South Dakota's best considered approach as an opening move to bind up old wounds. Kneip's call for careful consideration of the resolution is appropriate and helpful. An earnest, pragmatic ap-

proach, rather than an emotional outburst, is the next order of business in helping our South Dakota Indians—descendants of the first Americans—in making their way in the world of 1975.

TWO VIEWS OF THE FOOD SITUATION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Illinois State Journal-Register in Springfield, Ill., Mr. Ed Armstrong, recently issued a staff report which had a realistic appraisal of the economic riddle posed by food supply policy. In my view it is a useful contribution to the discussion now unfolding and gives an accurate appraisal of the problem viewed from the heartland of America. Here is the text of Mr. Armstrong's comments:

TWO VIEWS OF THE FOOD SITUATION

(By Ed Armstrong)

Food is often an emotional subject.

Some people react strongly to different types of food, perhaps even more to how it's prepared. Children particularly have clearly expressed likes or dislikes in the food line. That's obvious to me almost every evening at dinner from the antics and comments of my 9-year-old.

These days, however, food is an emotional subject in a far broader sense—from the housewife who complains about high grocery prices to the persons who are deeply concerned about hungry humans around the world.

It seems that every year or so we must have a "new" major issue for discussion—a newly recognized national or world crisis—in seminars, community groups, churches and at cocktail parties. This year it seems to be world food supply.

It's not a truly new subject by any means; it has been a matter of concern most of the time throughout the history of mankind, but usually it's one of those things that's just there, sort of looming in the background of the world like the threat of war.

Now it has been brought forward to center stage, likely to remain there for a while, then to fade again into the background as other topics such as poverty, racism, education, etc.

Two recent events in Springfield illustrate the complexity and magnitude of the food problem and the emotion it evokes. One was the World Affairs Conference on the subject of "Food: The Global Crisis." The other just four days later was a meeting at the State Fairgrounds at which the state agriculture director listened to farmers from around Illinois express their views on the current farm economy and what, if anything, they as individuals and a group should do about it.

The World Affairs Conference was far more sedate and detached in its discussion of food needs, production and distribution, because only a few of the participants—certainly far less than half of them—were persons who earn their livelihood from any phase of food production or handling.

Though some farmers participated in the discussions and expressed their concerns about the economics of the food situation, the focus was on its moral and political aspects, on the extent to which the United States should go in helping to feed the world and how it should go about it.

The spokesmen among the 800 farmers

who gathered in the drafty Illinois Building at the fairgrounds and tried to make themselves heard in the high ceilinged exhibition hall last Wednesday were unashamedly emotional; their livelihood depends on food production and the prices they get for what they produce.

Like any group of farmers, they expressed a broad range of opinions on what ought to be done in regard to food production, but only a couple alluded to any moral concerns in such production. To them raising food is a business and selling food—not giving it away—is their interest. They want to do their share to feed the hungry of the world, provided they can make an acceptable living doing it.

Two sentiments were expressed over and over: (1) There are so many more consumers than farmers—everyone is a consumer, but fewer than 5 of every 100 Americans are farmers—that government policy is geared to trying to keep the price of food down regardless of the effect on farm income, and (2) President Ford let the farmers of America down when he put controls on farm exports last October, sharply reducing the foreign market for U.S. grain.

Whereas the World Affairs Conference participants were concerned particularly with how the United States can produce more to help feed the hungry abroad, how we could eat less so the rest of the world could have more, or how to help those abroad produce more for themselves, the farmers were talking about cutting back on production for fear grain would become so abundant the price will drop below the cost of production.

Because grain prices have dropped approximately a third since last October in spite of a short harvest, and because of depressed prices for cotton, potatoes, dairy products and beef cattle, there is genuine concern by farmers about the prospect of more production this year than the market can absorb.

So while the hungry of much of the world, including some within our own country, will go unfed, it's likely that many an American farmer in 1975 will produce less than he could produce because it's in his own interest to cut back.

The food question is really an economic riddle. We can get as emotional as we want about the starving people of the world, but unless it's economically viable for people to produce food and the means exist to distribute that food and to pay for it, the production will not be accomplished.

All the attention the food issue is getting now is deserved, but pardon me for a pessimistic prediction that when all the study and discussion is done, the perennial issue of world hunger will quietly fade into the background to loom there just as it has since Adam and Eve left the garden.

OF DEFICITS AND DISASTER

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the growing blindness of the Congress and the administration to the true causes of our economic problems, there are a few voices across this Nation who speak out with a judgment unclouded by the unreality of Washington. One such newspaper is the Daily Times of Salisbury which recently published a telling assessment of the Federal budget and its impact.

I include this editorial at this point in my remarks:

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Daily Times, Feb. 25, 1975]

OF DEFICITS AND DISASTER

"When a conservative Republican president proposes a budget deficit of \$77 billion over two years, he's got to make a speech about the threat of federal spending," comments economist Arthur Okun, who was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under the Johnson administration.

"The trouble with the Ford budget," says Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) "is that he listened to those Republicans who still pray to the god of balanced budgets."

Put a microphone or a reporter in front of almost any Democrat or liberal and much the same kind of observation pooh-poohing the President's concern would be made.

Gerald Ford is guilty of innate conservative miserliness or insensitivity to the plight of the poor and unemployed or want of faith in the unbounded strength of the American economy by attempting to hold down the federal deficit for the coming fiscal year to something less than the greatest deficit racked up in the midst of World War II.

Just what the actual deficit for FY 1976 will be, nobody knows. The President forecasts one of \$52 billion in his proposed budget, but that includes trimming spending on various federal domestic programs by \$17 million—cuts that Democratic Congress adamantly opposes.

Arthur Okun to the contrary, the prospect is not for a budget deficit of \$77 billion over two years but that much or more in one year.

Well, all right. If any god is dead it is "the god of balanced budgets." Who remembers the last time there was a federal surplus, and was the country any better off for having it?

Yet somewhere along the line we are going to have to ask ourselves, what really is the limit to how deeply the government can go into hock at any one time?

Is there no threat at all that massive government borrowing could distort the economy more than it is already distorted and ultimately defeat the very ends we desire to achieve, especially when there are signs that inflation is at long last beginning to abate?

Common sense tells us there is some kind of limit. Otherwise the government could simply crank up the printing presses and award every American a million dollars. This would be fine, except that we know that shortly afterwards we would be paying \$10,000 for a pound of hamburger.

The government has no real money of its own. What it has is what it extracts from the economy by way of taxes. It can spend this money wisely in many ways to the benefit of the economy—by returning some of it to the pockets of the nonrich so that they have more to spend on consumer goods, by stimulating capital investment so that the nation's real wealth is increased.

But anything the government spends beyond what it acquires in taxes can only be created by diluting the purchasing power of every dollar.

A sizeable inflation of the nation's money supply, through the twin routes of tax cuts and maintained or increased government outlays, is the popular—and most experts agree, the necessary—thing to do right now to counter the recession.

But by ignoring the fundamental relationship between government income and economic productivity, by pretending that there is no bottom to the federal cornucopia, we are in danger of piling up ills for the future far worse than we would endure by failing to cure the problem of recession in one grand sweep.

The god of balanced budgets may be dead.

The gods of economic retribution are still very much alive.

THE TAXPAYERS WOULD SAVE \$10 BILLION EACH YEAR IN REDUCED FUEL COSTS IF THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION WERE ABOLISHED

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today about the rising costs of fuels, especially gasoline and heating oils.

We know much about those added costs resulting from higher prices being charged by the oil producing and exporting countries—OPEC. These costs rose sharply after the last Middle East war.

We know also about the billions of dollars we are paying in taxes when we buy oil and gasoline—taxes in the form of import fees, excise taxes, highway user taxes on gas and motor oils, even sales taxes at the local level.

What the majority of people in this country do not know enough about is the additional billions we are paying because of the bureaucratic costs of extensive government regulation and control of oil and gas.

The bureaucratic cost of all the Federal Energy Administration controls amounts to an estimated 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon. This is a burden on our consumers of roughly \$10 billion every year. Our consumers—already overburdened by direct taxes on fuels—are having to pay this much more—\$10 billion a year—in price at the pump and tank because of the added cost of doing business by oil producing and distributing companies required by FEA controls.

FEA control is, clearly, contrary to the consumer interest in reducing the cost of gases and oils. Prices they pay are being kept at higher levels because of excessive control.

The Wall Street Journal editorialized this week on the additional costs of oil and gas resulting from FEA. That editorial calls for the ending of all FEA controls, restoring to the consuming public the process of regulating price through the interplay of supply and demand. With production falling it would be wise for the Congress to immediately move to decontrol crude oil and natural gas.

This editorial warrants careful reading by every Member of Congress and by those within the administration responsible for the development of future policy on energy and costs.

The editorial follows:

AN END TO FEA

A few months back, when President Ford got rid of Energy Czar John Sawhill and was scouting around for a replacement, we suggested he fill the slot with a politician instead of a bureaucrat. Our idea was that a politician would incline to bend to pressures

from valid competing interests, and the Federal Energy Administration would soon be both ineffectual and harmless. A bureaucrat, on the other hand, would try to make FEA work, and in the process would maximize FEA's destructiveness.

The President picked Frank Zarb of his Office of Management and Budget, one of the most coldly efficient bureaucrats in Washington. So effective has he been in pushing the congressional mandate that we are now convinced that if FEA vanished today, and all its price controls were eliminated, the price of oil and gasoline at retail would actually decline. We also believe the domestic production of crude would shoot up, and the shock would test the cartel price.

A weak and ineffective bureaucracy poses few cost problems to the economy and consumer; industry can make things work by sliding around regulations and controls, staying a few steps ahead of the bureaucrats. But FEA has power and determination, and worse, an unusual degree of imagination. It has learned how to keep up with the industry, closing off loopholes, choking operations with paperwork—from production, through refining and transportation to marketing. At every point in the chain, the costs associated with misallocations, red tape and added risks are added in to the price structure that the consumer ultimately bears at retail.

Treasury Secretary Simon estimates that if price controls on crude oil are ended, which the President says he is planning to do on April 1, the cost to the economy would be \$9 billion a year. But the bureaucratic cost of all FEA controls amounts to an estimated 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon of product, according to varied industry sources. There are FEA officials who privately agree with the higher estimate, which rounds out to a bureaucratic burden of roughly \$10 billion a year that the private economy would recover if FEA simply vanished. If so, the price at retail would go down, not up, and instead of bureaucratic costs of \$10 billion, the oil industry would have \$9 billion for exploration and development.

That's only the beginning. By fixing the price of "old oil" at \$5.25 a barrel, while uncontrolled foreign and "new" domestic oil runs at \$11.50 a barrel, there is an enormous disincentive to produce out of the old fields, i.e., those that were producing prior to the base period in 1972.

First, inflation causes the real price to fall. \$5.25 today buys 12% less than it did a year ago. Second, the nation's 10,000 oil producers know that if old oil is decontrolled, every barrel they own will sell for more; why not sit back and wait? Third, integrated oil companies that own a lot of old oil are required by FEA to share it at \$5.25 a barrel with refiners that don't have it, a powerful incentive for companies with old oil to choke down old-oil production. Fourth, because a stripper well—one that produces 10 barrels a day or less—qualifies as "new oil," producers who have old wells capable of producing 15 barrels a day get a net benefit of about \$35 a day by producing five barrels a day less.

The net result is that even with new oil fetching more than \$11 a barrel, domestic production has fallen from 9,250,000 barrels a day prior to the embargo to 8,650,000 barrels. It is our guess that ending the allocation program and price controls would increase domestic production by up to one million barrels a day. Even if OPEC cut its production by that amount in order to sustain the cartel price, the U.S. would save \$4 billion a year in foreign exchange.

As it is, the coldly efficient bureaucrats at FEA are the best friends OPEC has in the United States, although the bureaucrats themselves can properly argue that they are only doing what they've been ordered to do by Congress.

Instead of facing up to the reality of what it has done, Congress seems to want more of the same. The Democratic liberals not only vow to put back oil-price controls if the President removes them, but also want to cut the new oil price back, which would be a gift with a ribbon to OPEC. The only way to end this costly mess would be for President Ford to explain it to the American people and win support for it. Ending all FEA controls—not only on the price of crude—would be the soundest energy program he could offer. We believed months ago that he would embark on this project, but he has not yet gotten up to speed.

JAMES M. STUART

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio House of Representatives on February 19, adopted a resolution honoring one of Ohio's most distinguished citizens, Mr. James M. Stuart, upon his retirement from active civic life and as a member of the board of directors of the Dayton Power & Light Co.

Mr. Stuart richly deserved this signal honor as he has vividly demonstrated by his corporate success that an intelligent, hard-working, and dedicated individual can, indeed, make the "American Dream" come true. At the same time, Mr. Stuart has actively and enthusiastically participated in many worthwhile civic and educational endeavors and has contributed greatly to improving his community and making it a better place in which to work and live.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to know Mr. Stuart for some time, and I have the highest possible regard and respect for him. He is an extremely knowledgeable and well-informed man who has for many years contributed generously of himself and his time in helping and encouraging others. His active participation in civic activities, particularly those benefitting our young people, clearly reflects his deep interest in and compassion for his fellow man, and he has set an outstanding example for our young people to emulate. As a longtime personal friend and admirer, I have a very real affection for Jim Stuart and heartily concur with the sentiments expressed in this resolution.

I would like to take this means of sharing the views of the members of the Ohio House with my colleagues and associating myself with them:

H.R. No. 66

Whereas, The members of the House of Representatives of the 111th General Assembly wish to take this opportunity to give well-deserved recognition to James M. Stuart upon the auspicious occasion of his retirement as a member of the Board of Directors of the Dayton Power and Light Company and from active civic life, and wish to extend our sincere thanks for his long and effective service on behalf of the citizens of Ohio; and

Whereas, James M. Stuart has been a part of the DP&L family since his entrance into the business world. He is a personification of the "American Dream" that a hard-working

and dedicated individual can indeed inaugurate a career at the lowest rung of the corporate ladder and reach the apex of the corporate world by utilizing his outstanding talents to the benefits of his fellow workers and community. James M. Stuart, as a corporate executive, never lost touch with the ordinary worker, the backbone of any business enterprise; he continued to be concerned for their welfare by utilizing his positions on their behalf; and

Whereas, James M. Stuart enthusiastically and effectively committed himself to many worthwhile civic causes, by serving as a Trustee of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, as a Director of Junior Achievement of Dayton, as President of Dayton Boy's Club, and a variety of other noteworthy civic organizations. His devotion to the betterment of his community is renowned; as a community leader and business executive he has proceeded to implement both the spirit and the goals of equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, religion, color, or sex; and

Whereas, James M. Stuart has pledged himself to the concept of providing meaningful higher education by serving as a concerned member of the Board of Trustees respectively of Wilmington College and Wilberforce University, and as a member of the University of Dayton's Associate Board of Trustees. His dedication to the goals of higher education have earned him well-deserved recognition. He has been awarded the Honorary Degrees of Doctor of Humanities, Doctor of Laws, and Doctor of Commercial Science, which are a fitting recognition for a man who is a scholar in his own right; therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 111th General Assembly of Ohio, in adopting this Resolution, hereby commend James M. Stuart for his consistently high level of achievement and for his many worthwhile contributions to society; and in so doing, salute one of Ohio's finest citizens and corporate officials, wishing him Godspeed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislative Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to James M. Stuart; to the Chairman of the Board of the Dayton Power and Light Company; to the Dayton Daily News; and to the Journal Herald, Dayton; and to the Kettering Oakwood Times.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Rick Inguanti, a senior at High Point High School, from Beltsville, Md., has written a timely and moving speech about the United Nations. This speech was given as part of the annual United Nations Association oratorical contest for high school students in the area. The program has been successful in interesting area high school students in international affairs and the role the United Nations could play.

As one of the four outstanding speakers this year, Rick will participate in a program at the Atrium Room of the Kennedy Center, April 26, 1975, to help raise funds so that the two finalists can observe U.N. field operations and meet with other students from foreign countries who are equally concerned. I hope the

quality of this speech will encourage other Members to attend.

The speech follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE

(By Rick Inguanti)

A conflict. Hostility. Irrationality. Violence. War. A worldwide nuclear holocaust. Self-destruction.

Has the Family of Man met its ultimate destiny? Billions of brothers and sisters have perished. Yet, a ray of hope remains. One man and one woman survive. They are the Family of Man's salvation. With them lies the task of resurrecting the human family. So, together, they create a master plan that will rebuild the world.

A song from the past echoes in their minds:

"We'll have children of the Kingdom.

They won't be torn by war, nor will they kill or hate, or hesitate to love justice."

Yes, their goal will be a universal peace. But how will they attain it?

Recalling Henry David Thoreau's plea to "Simplify," they determine the nucleus of their master plan. They must return to basics. They must restore the importance of the individual by promoting the fundamental rights of each man. They must not disregard but recognize and then encourage the flourishing of each man's innate rights. This man and woman realize that universal peace begins with an inner peace in every man.

But, can inner peace be attained while Man's Powers serve injustices? While a woman is denied her rights on the premise that she is inferior to a man? While a man is denied his rights on the premise that he is inferior to another man? While a nation is denied its rights on the premise that it is inferior to another nation? Thinking of these injustices, the man and woman agree to emphasize the constructive Powers of Man.

To avoid a contrast in male or female, black or white, Chinese or Russian, they will exalt the Power of freedom and equality in every man.

To avoid the invasion of family privacy, they will exalt the Power of the family—the building block of the Family of Man.

To avoid tyranny and dictatorship, they will exalt the Power of each man's voice in his government.

To avoid ignorance and a lack of awareness, they will exalt the Power of education—Man's key to advancement.

And, to avoid a standstill of that advancement, they will exalt Man's Powers of freedom of thought and expression. Man will be free to say what he means, mean what he thinks, and think anything he wishes. In freedom of mind there is inner tranquility.

Ladies and gentlemen, this man and woman have recognized that maintaining human rights is essential. They have learned what our United Nations has expressed to us—that to promote human rights is to preserve not only the dignity and the importance of the Family of Man but also the Family of Man itself. These rights set forth by the U.N. in 1948 are not abstract, idealistic phrases; they are a potential reality.

Who are the man and woman in the story? They are you and I. They represent every member of the Family of Man. It is up to the individual—you and me—to reach out for these human rights, to grasp them, and then to proudly exhibit them. No, we cannot erase the past, but we can begin to reconstruct. How?

First, each of us must develop a sense of empathy. Let us interact with every brother and sister with love, respect, compassion. Let us not just hear our brother—let us listen to him. And, let us not simply understand about him—let us strive to understand with him.

Also, we must remember that within you and me is the Power to forgive. This Power we must use unsparringly, for the Power to forgive is the Power to heal.

Yes, this task of rebuilding is yours and mine. This is one responsibility we cannot shirk; even the brilliant mind of a Henry Kissinger cannot achieve peace without us.

Let us hope that "In the year 2525, if man is still alive, if woman can survive, they may find . . ." what? A universal harmony in the human family, a high reward for our support of the innate rights of Man.

UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, HOLDS 34TH ANNUAL INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS BANQUET

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 15, 1975, I had the pleasure and the privilege of attending the 34th Annual Installation of Officers Banquet of the United Veterans Council of Youngstown, Inc.

In addition to being the principal speaker for the occasion, I was also selected for the United Veterans Council's highest award. Retiring Commander Vincent J. Doria presented me with the United Veterans Council's Man of the Year Award for my work as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. I am proud and honored to be the recipient of this award.

The United Veterans Council presented eight other awards, including: Veteran of the Year Award to Frank A. Russo, past United Veterans Council commander; Vietnam Veteran of the Year Award to Army CWO Joseph M. Sepesy; Commander's Awards to Mahoning County Commissioner Thomas Barrett, Youngstown Mayor Jack C. Hunter, and Youngstown Vindicator publisher William J. Brown; and, merit Awards to Sheriff Ray T. Davis, Veterans' Administration representative William Cunahan, and Mahoning County Commissioner George Bindas.

During the banquet, attorney Thomas Moore, a past commander of the United Veterans Council, installed John J. Giannini as the new commander, Robert Green as the new senior vice commander, S. Sgt. Walden Shehan as the new junior vice commander, Frank Bell as the new adjutant, Joseph T. Nivert as the new treasurer, and John Kirk as the new chaplain.

In my remarks to the council, I noted that the 93d Congress had passed more legislation of benefit to America's veterans and their dependents than any other Congress in our Nation's history. I also assured the council that the 94th Congress would build on the accomplishments of the 93d Congress and would continue to provide adequate funds for veterans' health, education, housing, compensation, and pension programs. In addition, I pledged my personal support

for legislation which will allow veterans to accept increased social security benefits without having their veterans' pension reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I insert excerpts from the United Veterans Council 34th Annual Installation of Officers Banquet program in the RECORD at this time:

THE UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL 34TH ANNUAL INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS BANQUET

IN HONOR OF

John J. Giannini, Jr., Commander.
Robert Green, Senior Vice-Commander.
S/Sgt. Walden Shehan, Junior Vice-Commander.
Frank Bell, Adjutant.
Joseph T. Nivert, Treasurer.
John Kirk, Sr., Chaplain.

PROGRAM

Welcome—LTC Vincent J. Doria, retiring commander.

Toastmaster—James E. McGinnis, past commander of U.V.C.

Pledge of allegiance to the flag—William R. Stambaugh and Assembly.

Invocation—Fr. John H. DeMarinis, pastor, St. Anthony's Church.

Dinner

Acknowledgment of guests—Toastmaster. Roll Call of U.V.C. Affiliated Organizations and U.V.C. Past Commanders—Toastmaster.

Greetings—Jack C. Hunter, Youngstown mayor.

Remarks—George J. Bindas, chairman, Mahoning County Commissioners.

Installation of Officers—Atty. Thomas M. Moore, past commander of U.V.C.

Remarks of New Commander—John J. Giannini, Jr.

Remarks of Retiring Commander—LTC Vincent J. Doria.

Awards Presentation—Michael Mislevy and Frank A. Russo.

Principal Speaker—Charles J. Carney, 19th District Congressman.

Benediction—Rev. Don Montgomery, 37th Division Association.

Banquet committee

LTC Vincent J. Doria, chairman; Gerald Hartman, Frank A. Russo, Atty. Thomas M. Moore.

Table Decorations: V.F.W. 8841 Ladies' Auxiliary.

OUTSTANDING VIETNAM VETERAN'S AWARD

The United Veterans Council will present to Chief Warrant Officer/Helicopter Pilot Joseph M. Sepesy the Outstanding Vietnam Veteran's Award.

CWO Sepesy, 534 Catalina Ave., Youngstown, Ohio, during his three tours of duty in Vietnam, earned 73 Air Medals, two with a "V" for valor; two Army Commendation Medals; the Presidential Unit Citation; three Bronze Stars; Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. He had over 2,000 hours' combat time.

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

January 20, 1975—Organizational, ITAMS 3.

February 15, 1975—Installation, VFW 8841.

February 17, 1975—Business, VFW 3307.

March 17, 1975—Business, AMVETS 44.

April 21, 1975—Business, CWV 1222.

May 17, 1975—Graves Decoration, American Legion.

May 19, 1975—Business, ITAMS 3.

May 26, 1975—Memorial Day, All Posts.

June 16, 1975—Business, VFW 4237.

Recess for summer

September 15, 1975—Business, VFW 2799.

October 20, 1975—Business, VFW 6730.

November 11, 1975—Veteran's Day, All Posts.

November 17, 1975—Business (Nominations), PLAV 87.

December 15, 1975—Business (Election of Officers), VFW 6488.

January 31, 1976—Installation, VFW 8841.

Every Sunday, 11:30 A.M., WBBW Veterans' Show.

All Post meetings printed in Sunday Vindicator.

THE UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL OF YOUNGSTOWN, INC.

(Founded After Pearl Harbor Day)

Purpose

To provide at the community level a coordinating and planning agency for properly qualified and duly constituted veterans organizations in the city of Youngstown, Ohio, and its environs which might desire membership therein; to aid all member organizations acting in concern with each other in planning and carrying out of functions and operations of a civic, patriotic or veteran character; to attempt by all honorable means to promote and effectuate the construction of a Living War Memorial commemorative of the war dead of the community; and to do all things reasonably or incidental to the foregoing except such as might interfere with the internal operation of any member group or groups.

U.V.C. Past Commanders continue to serve as advisors to all committees. Approximately ten attend all monthly meetings to assist various chairmen.

Past commanders

*Ralph R. Pabst.
*John J. Kennedy.
*James A. Dalton.
Atty. Ralph R. Miller.
*I. L. Feuer.
*John E. Doyle.
*Atty. William L. Powers.
*Leo F. McCarthy.
Atty. William F. Powers.
*John W. Wallace.
Chester Amedia.
Frank Posey.
Edward L. Cook.
Atty. Thomas M. Moore.
*Michael J. Whalen.
Martin Cole.
Roy "Rummy" DePaul.
Dr. Seymour Feuer.
Michael Mislevy.
Fred A. Goglio.
Stephen L. Ritz.
Gerald G. Hartman.
Richard E. Kelly.
Anthony J. DeAngelis.
Frank J. Colla.
Raymond J. Kobus.
William R. Stambaugh.
Frank A. Russo, P.E.
Albert D. Kennedy.
Robert J. Bacha, Sr.
James E. McGinnis.
Mary T. Burrows.
Vincent J. Doria.

UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL—AFFILIATED POSTS AND COMMANDERS

Amvets Post No. 34, Veronica Janecko.
Amvets Post No. 35, William J. Carney.
Amvets Post No. 44, S/Sgt. Walden Shehan.
Amvets Post No. 711, Mose Johnson.
Boardman Veterans Association, Jake Moretti.
Catholic War Veterans Post No. 1222, John Bury.
Catholic War Veterans Post No. 1292, Stephen P. Kuhns.
D.A.V. Chapter No. 2, John Mastrivalls.
D.A.V. Chapter No. 17, Ron Frazzini.
Italian-American Veterans Post No. 2, Frank D'Appolito.
Italian-American Veterans Post No. 3, Michael DeMarco.

* Deceased.

Italian-American Veterans Post No. 10, Anthony Cua.
 Italian-American Veterans Post No. 12, Joseph Modarelli.
 Italian-American Veterans Post No. 17, Neal Buzzaco.
 Mahoning Valley Basha CBIVA,* Ed De-Capita.
 MV Chapt. PHDS Association, John W. Herm.
 Montford Point Marine Association, Robert Little.
 Jewish War Veterans No. 59, Nick Lustig.
 Military Order of Cooties, Pup Tent No. 31, Ralph Guglielmin.
 Military Order Purple Heart No. 186, Andrew Pastrick.
 Polish Legion American Vets No. 87, Chuck Pops.
 Reserve Officers Association, Capt. Robert P. Milich.
 Romanian-American Volunteers, Sam Muntean.
 Seabee Veterans, Island X8, Richard Stout.
 37th Division Veterans Association, Donald Thomas.
 Veterans of W. W. I Barracks No. 594, F. W. Busch.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 93, James Romito.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 1423, Robert Bacha, Sr.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 1588, Robert Tutwiler.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 2799, Robert Davis.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 3307, John E. Soles.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 3538, Robert Raney.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 3782, Frank Bell.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 4237, Louis Constantino, Jr.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 5432, Harry Fitzgerald.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 6488, Jimmy Davis.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 6730, Robert Reichart.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 7538, John Svoda.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 7600, Homer G. Dyce.
 Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 8841, Joseph DiFiore.

GILMAN SEEKS TO OVERCOME ROUTE 7 DECISION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills to grant the Secretary of Transportation the discretion to permit the States the right to prepare environmental impact statements required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

On December 11, 1974, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit—including New York, Connecticut, and Vermont—handed down a decision in the case of *Conservation Society of Southern Vermont, Inc. v. Volpe*, 7 ERC 1236, ruling that environmental impact statements required by the National En-

vironmental Policy Act must be prepared by FHWA and not by state transportation agencies. In its ruling, the court affirmed an injunction against further Federal participation in route 7 construction in Vermont, even though the court found that the substance of the environmental impact statement as prepared by the State of Vermont was in full compliance with NEPA.

While the decision is directed only to the highway over which suit was brought, the ruling still serves notice that any Federal highway project in New York, Vermont, and Connecticut might be enjoined if suit is brought on the grounds that the environmental impact statement was not prepared by the FHWA.

Recognizing this conundrum, FHWA, by letter dated January 9, 1975, to the New York State Department of Transportation, imposed a freeze on project approvals for the Federal-aid highway program, except for minor projects such as safety improvements. The Federal Highway Administration specified in their letter that it will not act on requests for approval of preliminary engineering authorizations or plans, specifications or estimates or right-of-way acquisitions nor any other step in the process of developing a highway project.

In the second circuit States—New York, Vermont, and Connecticut—the freeze affects some 147 Federal-aided highway projects on which construction would begin in 1975 and 1976. Eighty of those projects are in New York alone. In addition, the freeze stops the development of over 200 projects in New York on which construction would commence in the period 1977 to 1980.

The construction work affected in New York, not including New York City's West Side Highway, is \$1.6 billion. Every type of Federal highway project is on the list, interstate, urban extensions, city arterials, rural primary, and rural secondary.

This freeze has a severe impact on my own district—the 26th. In Rockland County, this means the complete halt of the planning of the construction process on the Spring Valley By-Pass which has been scheduled for fiscal 1976-77. In addition, the planning work has stopped on the second span of the Newburgh Beacon Bridge, and the list goes on and on.

What I am proposing today is two simple amendments to NEPA and to the Federal highway law providing, retroactively to January 1, 1970, that environmental impact statements can be prepared by the State agency subject to approval of the Federal Administrator. Such amendments would in no way change the substantive requirements of Federal law.

With the recent release of \$2 billion of impounded Federal highway funds by the Department of Transportation, the need to resolve this situation as quickly as possible has been dramatized even more.

I urge my colleagues to act quickly and decisively on this issue which is of vital concern to all of us.

PROBLEMS OF INFLATION AND FOREIGN INVESTMENT

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman JOSEPH GAYDOS of Pennsylvania, has repeatedly called our attention to the problems of foreign investment.

I recently read an article in the Illinois Business Review, published by the University of Illinois, in which Prof. Folke Dovring of that institution suggests a number of things which we ought to weigh as we approach the three problems of energy resources, balance of payments, and foreign investments.

I insert his excellent statement in the RECORD at this point:

PROBLEMS OF INFLATION AND FOREIGN INVESTMENT

(By Folke Dovring, professor of agricultural economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

The public should be told the facts about the connection between inflation and oil imports. The United States is running large deficits for the import of petroleum, and this is a primary cause of the inflation we have. In this country, oil becomes gasoline more than anything else, and when we search for a way out of the energy problem, gasoline is the most logical target for action, unpopular as it may be to say so.

When pointing to a single factor such as gasoline as being specially responsible for inflation, I am not overlooking a host of other factors. Many thoughtful commentators have discussed a long list of interacting inflationary forces. But placing the focus on a single major commodity is neither frivolous nor entirely new. Economists who are used to observing dynamic changes are attentive to the magnified effect which some "strategic" or "key" factors may have on the economy as a whole. From France in the 1950s, we have the phrase that "inflation feeds on red meat"; demand and supply of meat were such that meat tended to be a chronic source of economic instability.

In the United States, the recent upward trends in consumption of meat and energy are on a collision course. Because of the strain which both place on the balance of payments, something has to yield. Americans will have to choose between steaks and driving. In the United States, the role of meat in the economy is not what it was in France in the 1950s. But the necessity to maintain large exports of feedgrains places upward pressure on the price of meat in the United States, and imports of meat take away some of the foreign exchange earned by grain exports. Gasoline contributes to inflation because of the effect of high-priced oil imports on the balance of payments. It appears that Americans prefer gasoline to beef, but neither commodity gives way sufficiently to relieve the foreign exchange situation.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE PROBLEM OF THE 1970'S

The American economy is no longer so self-sufficient as it was for most of the last 10 years. Until a few years ago, the annual value of imports and exports amounted to no more than 5 to 6 percent of the national product. Foreign trade is good for competition, but most of the goods imported were such that the country could do without the imports if it had to. Now, our basic self-

*China-Burma-India Veterans Association.

reliance for raw materials is gone. Foreign trade is a larger percentage of national product than it used to be, and more of the import are for essentials: recently, oil has risen to represent one-fourth of all US imports, and other materials which are necessary for industry, such as bauxite (aluminum ore), also are largely imported.

This momentous change in the international economic situation would not have been very serious but for two facts. One is the already very large "dollar debt" (amount of dollars held by foreigners) which has accumulated over many years. The other is the peculiar situation of some among the most important oil-exporting countries which have very limited need of American exportable goods and therefore hold continuously swelling balances of dollars.

The magnitude of the "dollar debt" is difficult to size up with any accuracy. Estimates cited from international money markets indicate that it is so large that it would take a stretch of years to redeem it even if we had very favorable trade balances coming, which are not in sight. Many people are not aware of this, but American dollars in the hands of foreigners are so many IOU's waiting to be redeemed in goods or services from this country.

The dollar ceased to be backed by gold a few years ago. Like other national currencies, it is now backed in international exchange only by the goods the country can supply in export trade. What this means for foreign trade policy does not seem to be generally understood. The currency situation, combined with the dollar debt, makes it inadvisable to embargo exports, even of essential goods such as food. The attempt to do so with soybeans pointed up the conflict between domestic price control and the foreign markets—on which a national government cannot control prices. The lesson has yet to go home, for again in 1974—with the prospect of a short harvest of corn and soybeans—some politicians are advocating export embargoes. Such proposals overlook the realities of our foreign economic relations. We can make our way in the world economy only by producing what is wanted. The US has to export what the foreign owners of dollars want, even if this leads to restrictions on our own consumption.

The events of 1973 showed how a currency problem will "import" inflation in at least two ways: by the prices buyers in other countries are willing and able to pay for our exportable goods, and by the higher prices we must pay for imports, above all those of essential goods such as oil and other necessary raw materials. The latter become a heavy burden because the sellers of scarce materials have begun to exploit their favored position—the oil countries took the lead, the bauxite countries followed, and still others may in due time do the same.

Just now inflationary pressures from abroad are not particularly evident, because inflation in the United States is not far behind that in other industrial countries. But if domestic policy to curb inflation in the U.S. were to have any success, then foreign trade would reactivate inflationary pressures. With domestic prices advancing slower than those abroad, the dollar would in effect become undervalued, causing new demands on our exportable goods.

OIL IMPORTS AND THE DOLLAR DEBT

In the last year or two, the location of the dollar debt has changed somewhat. The dollar amounts available in Europe and Japan have been reduced (though they are still very large), but the dollar holdings of Iran and the Arab countries have increased strongly.

Continued inflation will give a strong motive to the oil countries to invest their dollars in the United States. Whenever Arab and Iranian investments in this country take

place on some considerable scale, their effect will be twofold. For one thing, they will create a permanent and growing national debt for which the United States economy will have to pay as any other debtor, by annual interest payments which would be a continuous and growing drain on our domestic resources. For another, such investments will give the foreign governments economic and financial leverage on the U.S.

There are those who say that such foreign investments in this country are no more a serious matter than are American investments in other countries. Such a statement misses an essential difference. When an American firm builds a factory in Brazil, it not only becomes owner of a productive asset in Brazil; it also creates that asset, and Brazil is not getting any poorer for it, because real investment has taken place with foreign means. When Iran or Saudi Arabia or Kuwait acquires land, industrial shares, government bonds, and so on in the United States, no real investment takes place—existing assets change hands, that is all. When paying for oil imports with the ownership of part of the country's national wealth, the United States will be acting like a family which finances its grocery bill by mortgaging its house.

Nor is it correct to say (as some observers do) that "we can use the capital." This country is not suffering any shortage of investable funds. The Federal Reserve System tries to restrict credit as a way of fighting inflation. Repatriation of foreign-owned dollars against domestic assets is about as beneficial as any other credit expansion during inflation. It will simply mean more money without more goods to go around.

SAVING OF ENERGY

When oil imports are gradually weakening the domestic economy, what are the alternatives? "Project Independence" will not answer, not alone in any event, for with recent trends projected into the future, the investment needs for energy independence are simply too large to contemplate. New sources of energy usually require more capital—and energy—than the old ones. The energy trend cannot be satisfied by development of domestic sources. Even with imports, the total in combination would place too large burdens on the economy. The trend is going to break—either it will be broken by deliberate policy action based on careful economic analysis, or else it will break by itself, accompanied by assorted economic disorders, some of them too dangerous to accept. The crisis of late 1973 and early 1974 was merely an advance warning; it can easily become a great deal worse.

Breaking the energy trend can be done in a variety of ways, and all plausible ways will have to be used in combination, as shown by a study group working for the Ford Foundation. Many of these measures are productivity improvements, since various productive processes can "make do" with less energy. In agriculture, we already have a departure toward "no-tillage cropping" (planting crops without plowing), and there are many others under way in industry. But the largest area of potential energy saving, in this country and at this time, is in transportation—foremost the use of passenger cars.

How heavily the automobile weighs on the economy can be shown by data on gasoline, most of which is used by passenger cars. Gasoline accounts for close to 47 percent of all oil processed in US refineries. Since the refineries use a good deal of energy for their own operation, the gasoline delivered to the economy represents, on a net basis, more than half of the raw petroleum. This rate of gasoline yield is unique. For the world as a whole, the rate is less than 25 percent; for the rest of the world (subtracting only the United States) it is about 15 percent of the raw petroleum. In Europe and Japan, most of the oil becomes industrial

fuel oil and diesel fuel. Per capita consumption of gasoline in the United States is twice that in Canada and 4 to 5 times the levels in most European countries. About half of all the gasoline in the world is made and used in the United States.

When the use of energy is calculated in proportion to the national product, it turns out that the American economy is one of the most energy intensive in the world. It would be a mistake to believe that this must be so in a country with a high income level. The proportion was just as high 20 years ago when the income level in the US was lower. In the meantime, consumption of gasoline rose faster than the use of energy for other purposes.

GROWTH OF THE ENERGY PROBLEM

How did the United States economy become so energy intensive? In a sense it may have appeared logical in the past. When energy was cheap and few people listened to warnings about shortages ahead, it was in fact economical to squander this cheap resource. Thus traffic intensity was made very high. The superhighway system was extended into the cities, passenger trains and urban mass transit systems were allowed to decay, suburban settlement was expanded almost without limit, and shopping centers were served by acres of parking spaces. Economic policy for the United States was made by private industry, foremost the oil companies. Naturally, they made it for their own interests, even where these did not coincide with those of the nation. It can be argued whether the oil and automobile companies are to blame for the energy impasse we are in. The national government is to blame for allowing the national economy to drift into this impasse for lack of leadership.

Many analysts simply throw up their hands and declare that the real-estate system already is such that Americans have to commute by car. This is oversimplifying the situation. Commuters need only get the healthy habit of walking three or four blocks to a mass transit stop. Then bus lines will become quite profitable—and more efficient than now—even in sprawling areas of one-family housing. It is the height of irony when a President can contemplate vetoing a mass transit bill as "inflationary," when in fact the lack of mass transit feeds inflation so much.

A large-scale switch from individual to mass-transit transportation could save from 10 to 15 percent of the oil used in this country, eventually as much as 20 percent. This is a large part of all the oil imports and such a saving would be critically beneficial to the whole foreign exchange problem.

For such a switch to succeed, and rapidly, it is important what means are used to bring it about. Mere exhortation will not do, for in such matters "voluntary action" will hurt the loyal and benefit the shirkers. For control of automobile traffic, the logical place is where the cars stand still. For instance, the Environmental Protection Agency has just taken an initiative in restricting parking areas in Boston to reduce air pollution. Parking space is under administrative control of municipalities and institutions, so they have the power to restrict traffic by restricting parking space. Government at all levels should take the lead by denying parking permits to those of their employees who have ready access to mass transit for commuting. With effective leadership, a switch-over could take place in much shorter time than is suggested for most measures to control inflation.

WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL POSSIBILITIES?

Many observers are likely to dismiss the idea of saving energy in this way as being too unpopular. What is popular in this country is, however, in part a matter of informing the public. Much could be gained if two points were forcefully driven home. One is

the fact that such large energy savings are necessary for the economic health of the country. The other is that restriction of traffic by means of control over parking space would be done on the basis of individual need rather than income. By contrast, a high gasoline tax would hurt those who can least afford it and thus deepen some social class distinctions; it would also tend to reduce the recreational use of the car, as for vacations and outings.

It is hard to believe that Americans in general would want to mortgage the future of their country just for the pleasure of driving to work. But communicating the facts of life to the public is in part a matter of wanting to communicate. Our government leaders appear to ignore the foreign exchange problem as a source of inflation. President Nixon did not mention it in his Los Angeles speech last summer, and President Ford hardly touched upon it in his address to the joint houses of Congress. And yet, here is really where one could find some reason to think that wage-and-price control is not so simple as it was 20 or 30 years ago.

For people in government, there may be a temptation just to let inflation ride. Governments at all levels gain advantages from inflation, because their revenues based on incomes and sales rise and the real value of their outstanding bonds declines. As a complication, the nation also gains some advantage because the "dollar debt" also falls in real value because of inflation.

But if there is going to be a real effort to abate inflation, then it must first be recognized that the balance-of-payments situation, and especially the oil imports, are a primary cause of inflation, at present probably more important than the federal budget. To correct this, something serious must be done about energy. Use of energy must be held down by much more vigorous measures than have been tried to date. American overconsumption of gasoline is a serious defect in our economy.

POSTAGE RATES GOING UP

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following editorial into the RECORD. The editorial was written by Keith Anderson of the Daily Republic newspaper published in Mitchell, S. Dak. This South Dakota newspaper serves approximately 17,000 people in 10 counties in central South Dakota.

I believe this editorial reflects the wishes of the people of South Dakota. They hope that the rate increases on postal service will be used on improvement of postal service and not on frills. The American people want government to "tighten its belt" and spend dollars only on necessities.

The editorial follows:

[From the Mitchell Daily Republic, Feb. 20, 1975]

POSTAGE RATES GOING UP

Speaking of inflation, the plight of the first class postage stamp is heading in such spiraling direction that it may soon cost Americans double to mail that letter which was delivered for only 6 cents in 1968.

Our new Postmaster General, Benjamin F. Ballar, sees postal patrons paying 12 or 13 cents this year for first class postage to off-

set more than \$800 million in deficit spending by the Postal Service. He claims the department is experiencing the same inflationary problems as others, and, is speculating that there will be some problems ahead this summer when negotiations begin for postal workers to renew their contracts. All this adds up to higher postage rates, and the distinct possibility that the National Guard may be called in to move your mail if negotiations stall.

While Ballar appeared less than optimistic at avoiding a rate increase, he did express a certain degree of dignity in saying that his department is depending less on public subsidies to maintain postal operations. He remarked that in 1971 when the postal department reorganized, it was relying on 17.7 percent public subsidies. Since, it has declined to a low of 15.4 percent.

The last increase in first class postage came last March when stamps went from 8 to 10 cents. While rates have climbed, the postal service declined in efficiency under the direction of then Postmaster General, Elmer Klassen. Hopefully, our new director will strive to improve postal service and not get carried away as did his predecessor who squandered away money on extravagant surroundings, forgetting the responsibilities affixed to his title.

TVA'S MASSIVE ENERGY GRAB

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the rules which other Americans must respect are ignored with impunity by governmental agencies and regulated industries.

It is no accident that government regulation of and intervention in the economy produces negative results. Liberal reformers who believed otherwise in the 1920's learned a lesson which modern liberals must now relearn. Frederic G. Howe, a progressive who had been in the Wilson administration wrote in 1925 in his "Confessions Of A Reformer" that he had become distrustful of the Government and he now "viewed it as the source of exploitation rather than the remedy for it."

One of the problems with government is that it believes that the rules it makes for others are not applicable to its own activities. Consider the current efforts of the Tennessee Valley Authority to acquire ownership of Peabody Coal, the Nation's largest single coal producer. Many observers believe that such an acquisition by TVA would be an important step in the direction of nationalizing that entire industry.

Discussing this situation, Harold C. Gordon writes that,

TVA already owns thousands of acres of coal-rich lands; its estimated reserves are between 400 and 500 million tons. . . . What private coal companies fear is that if T.V.A.—the tax-exempt, federally subsidized corporation—is allowed to acquire Peabody, it will dump the surplus coal on the market at a price with which they will be unable to compete. Alternatively, it might be added that if T.V.A. acquires Peabody and decides to produce only enough coal for its own re-

quirements, the consuming public will be denied the energy value of 35 million tons of coal a year.

The irony is clear for all to see. Mr. Gordon declares that,

At a time when private energy companies are being routinely denounced as greedy, power-grasping monopolists—indifferent to the consumer's welfare—a public service corporation is empire building in a manner worthy of Commodore Vanderbilt.

It is important that TVA not be permitted to continue to operate in this manner. It is also important that the Federal Trade Commission, which is ordering that Peabody be sold by Kennecott Copper, its parent company, not be permitted to use its authority to enhance the power of another governmental body.

I wish to share with my colleagues the important article, "TVA's Mammoth Energy Grab," by H. C. Gordon distributed by the U.S. Industrial Council, and insert it into the RECORD at this time. [From the USIC Editorial Research Reports]

TVA'S MAMMOTH ENERGY GRAB

(By H. C. Gordon)

In 1934, when the Supreme Court upheld the right of the Tennessee Valley Authority to engage in the direct sale of electric power, Justice James McReynolds issued an incisive and prophetic dissent. TVA, he declared, had embarked upon a "pretentious scheme" to standardize the rates of private utilities and to attain "no less a goal than the electrification of America."

The relentless expansion of TVA over the ensuing decades has given an ominous tone to Justice McReynolds' initial warning. Today, TVA is the largest supplier of electricity in the United States: a multi-billion dollar federal octopus with an ever-widening network of tentacles.

In light of this fact, TVA's current efforts to acquire Peabody Coal—this country's largest single coal producer—can only be viewed with the gravest misgivings. Such a move, many observers believe, would actually be a giant step toward nationalization of the entire industry.

What does TVA want with Peabody Coal? The answer is even more intriguing than the question.

Although it was supposedly created for the purpose of improving navigation and flood control through the construction of a series of dams (with hydroelectric power to be merely an "incidental" benefit of the project) TVA had not been long in the energy business before it came to rely predominantly on coal-fired steam generators to maintain and expand its service. At the present time it is the biggest coal consumer in the country, with coal-fired steam accounting for over 75% of its generating capacity.

But this fact in itself is insufficient either to explain or to justify TVA's designs on Peabody. TVA already owns thousands of acres of coal-rich lands; its estimated reserves are between 400 and 500 million tons. Furthermore, its annual consumption of coal is only 35 million tons while Peabody's annual production is 70 million tons.

What private coal companies fear (and TVA's ruthless treatment of competitors in the past gives them ample cause) is that if TVA—a tax-exempt, federally subsidized corporation—is allowed to acquire Peabody, it will dump the surplus coal on the market at a price with which they will be unable to compete. Alternatively, it might be added that if TVA acquires Peabody and decides to produce only enough coal for its own requirements, the consuming public will be denied the energy value of 35 million tons of coal a year.

What irony! At a time when private energy companies are being routinely denounced as greedy, power-grasping monopolists—in different to the consumers' welfare—a public service corporation is empire building in a manner worthy of Commodore Vanderbilt.

The irony is compounded by the fact that Peabody's parent company, Kennecott Copper, is being forced to sell its subsidiary by order of the Federal Trade Commission. The Commission ruled (and was subsequently affirmed by the federal courts) that since Kennecott already owned a small coal mining operation when it acquired Peabody, its acquisition of a major competitor constituted a violation of the antitrust laws. It may thus be safely said that if TVA were a private concern there is no way in which it would be permitted to conclude such a transaction.

Fortunately, there are several private companies which are also interested in buying Peabody—none of which are presently engaged in coal mining. Also, fortunately, there appears to be growing opposition in Congress to TVA's proposed purchase. This is well indeed. If this deal goes through it will mark a significant milestone on the road to socialism.

UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL,
Nashville, Tenn., February 20, 1975.
HON. PHILIP M. CRANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE: Pardon my presumption, but I thought that the enclosed editorial might be of interest to you in light of the splendid work you have been doing in the cause of economic liberty.

Space limitations unfortunately prevented me from giving additional details on this incredible story. For example, Peabody Coal, on top of its domestic reserves, also owns the controlling interest in an Australian coal mining concern which sells to the Japanese. Ergo, if TVA succeeds in its bid to acquire Peabody, it will thereby go multi-national. (Quick! Call Ralph Nader! Senator Hart! The Justice Department!) Today, the Tennessee Valley—tomorrow, the world!

I wish the situation really were that funny. It is in times like these that we really appreciate men like yourself.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your devoted admirer,

HAROLD C. GORDON.

OFFICIAL NATIONAL GEM

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I think is most appropriate as we approach our 200th birthday.

The bill is one which will make turquoise the official national gemstone of the United States. In addition to making turquoise the national gemstone, I think it most appropriate that the gemstone be designated the official gem of our National Bicentennial of 1976.

The reasons for selecting turquoise as our national stone are many and varied; although turquoise would serve well as our national stone because of its beauty and heritage alone.

But to tell you something about the fine heritage of this stone which so truly represents the entire Nation: Turquoise was the first stone in recorded history

of man to be used as a gem, according to the Library of Congress.

It is also interesting to note, and very appropriate, too, when considering the upcoming 200th anniversary of our Nation's birth, that turquoise is the gemstone most prized by the native American. Not only do today's American Indians make exquisite jewelry, the focal point of which is turquoise, but in the earliest years, they used this precious stone as money. What could be more meaningful than naming the stone so prized by the first Americans as our Nation's symbol at the very time we are celebrating the birth of our Nation.

And, it should not go unnoticed that turquoise is the only gemstone in our Nation which is found in great quantity in many of our States. It is also one of a very few stones in the world to be classified as a precious stone, and most assuredly is the most prevalent gemstone in the United States to be so classified.

My friends at the Bureau of Mines tell me that turquoise is, in terms of value, the most sought after stone in U.S. mining operations. Of course, those of us from any of the turquoise producing States in this country can testify to the demand for this handsome gem. And anyone who has sought the precious stone knows that it is in extremely great demand throughout the entire United States, not only as jewelry of rare quality and beauty, but also as a good investment.

Do not mistake the introduction of this bill as the attempt of any singular region to lay claim to the national stone for this distinctive gemstone comes from places so widespread as New Jersey, Alabama, Virginia, Texas, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, California, and New Mexico.

To demonstrate the immense value placed on this gem I have only to tell you that the Aztec Indians of Central America, who had the mineral men prize most, gold, went into what is now our American Southwest to find turquoise. In fact, turquoise was so highly valued by this "nation of gold" that they demanded turquoise as a tribute from the neighboring states of the Aztec nation. And turquoise was always a desired stone of the Spaniards when they made explorations into the Southwest.

However, it is with the American Indian that the most important historical heritage of turquoise lives. For hundreds of years the great Indian culture of this country has included turquoise for many reasons. The god of gambling, Noholipi, according to Indian legend, owed his remarkable luck to a piece of turquoise. Indians for centuries used turquoise to ward off evil and to bring good luck. In fact, there was hardly any phase of Indian life which did not include turquoise in some way or another.

Of course, today we see much fine silver and turquoise Indian jewelry on the market but that represents only the last 95 years of history of turquoise in this country. One authority has said the Indians did not begin to use silver until 1880 and that before that turquoise stood alone as a jewel.

There are some unique qualities about turquoise in addition to it being so

highly prized by the first Americans. For instance, the turquoise found in Virginia is the first and only crystallized turquoise to be found any place in the entire world. In that regard I bow to my esteemed colleague Mr. DAN DANIEL for that unique turquoise was discovered in his district in Campbell County.

I have already mentioned that turquoise is the oldest stone in existence to be used as a gem and that face certainly places this typically American stone in a class by itself.

Now, I wish to ask my friends of those other States in which turquoise is found to join us in our effort to make this beautiful gem our official national stone. Of course, my good friend and fellow New Mexican Mr. RUNNELS is knowledgeable about this fine gem since his district includes the areas from which some of the Nation's best turquoise and turquoise jewelry comes.

Congresswoman FENWICK has reason to be proud for in Somerset County of New Jersey are found specimens of the gem.

My two distinguished colleagues from Alabama, Mr. FLOWERS and Mr. NICHOLS both represent districts where turquoise is mined.

And the State of Texas has turquoise from the district represented by Mr. RICHARD WHITE.

There are three fellow representatives from my neighbor from the north, Colorado, who represent districts bearing turquoise. They are Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. EVANS of Colorado and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

I am sure that all my colleagues from Arizona will join in this recognition of turquoise as the national stone, as it is found in the districts represented by the distinguished minority leader Mr. RHODES and his fellow Arizonans Mr. UDALL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona and Mr. CONLAN.

And since turquoise is considered good luck, I think that it is most fitting that Mr. SANTINI of Nevada represents a State from which the gem is mined. We can all use a lot more good luck when visiting his fine State.

And while the Golden State of California may get its name from another mineral, I know that my colleagues Mr. BOB WILSON and Mr. BURGNER, both of whom come here representing districts in which turquoise is found, will help this effort.

The United States should have a national stone—a stone which is of this country, a stone which is representative of the true beauty we have all inherited, a stone which tells a story of the history of America, a stone which can be proudly put on a pedestal with the other precious gemstones of the world. We need a stone which shows the strength of this land and its people and yet which is beautiful and graceful.

We have this stone. We have turquoise. Turquoise has the blue of the sky, the azure of the sea, the green of the grasslands, and the ribbons of brown as in the Earth. Turquoise has the smooth calmness of a lake on a windless day and it has the ruggedness of the great mountains of this country.

So, for these reasons and more than I

could name within the time I have to speak, I ask that this esteemed body name turquoise as our national gemstone.

CAN CRIME BE CONQUERED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent speech by the Honorable Johannes F. Spreen, sheriff of Oakland County, Mich., one of Michigan's largest counties. Sheriff Spreen is an educator and law enforcement officer with over 37 years experience.

His comments effectively lay out the fashion in which the Nation should begin to combat crime. I believe the action suggested by Sheriff Spreen, vigorous enforcement of the law, is far superior to removing firearms from the hands of law-abiding citizens.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY PROFESSOR JOHANNES F. SPREEN, SHERIFF OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH.

In 1938, J. Edgar Hoover spoke to the Detroit Economic Club. His subject was "Lawlessness as a National Menace." A few days ago Clarence Kelley, the current director of the F.B.I. addressed the Detroit Economic Club on that very same topic, asking the question, "Can Crime Be Conquered?" Sad, isn't it, that 37 years later the problem still exists, to an even greater degree. Something must be done, and NOW, so that 37 years from now in the year 2012, we will not be asking, "Can crime be conquered?"

Citizens are being murdered daily in their own homes and businesses and police who respond to aid them are constantly laying their lives on the line.

I speak today as a police educator, but also from 37 years of police study and experience, having opened my first police textbooks the same year J. Edgar Hoover was in Detroit. I have seen the toll in robberies, burglaries, rapes. I have seen citizens frightened and killed. I have seen policemen hurt and shot. I have attended their funerals. In the past ten years a thousand law enforcement officers were killed and 70 percent by individuals using handguns. They walk and work on the fingertips of death.

There is no reason why this massacre—this uneven battle—should continue.

The time for action is now.

Four years ago, in May, 1971, I wrote a news column calling for an additional jail sentence for the carrying of a gun when it is used in the commission of certain crimes. I recommended five years mandated by law with no probation, no parole, no early release, no good time.

I believe the Judiciary of Michigan should still have discretion over punishment for the crime itself, but no discretion on the charge of using a gun to commit it if he is convicted by a jury of his peers. I believe these "peers" are sick and tired of this nonsense.

We must do something about handgun control, but there is a vital difference between gun control and gun prohibition. Let's not make criminals out of people who buy or have guns out of fear, to protect their loved ones, themselves, or their homes. We are not going to accomplish anything by trying to ban all handguns. We are not going to get the gun away from the criminal.

Some are supporting a drive to prohibit

bullets. Their slogan "you need a bullet like you need a hole in the head". Commendable, but naive. I assure you that the potential killer, killer-burglar, killer-robber, killer-rapist will have his gun and get the bullets, too.

We know that police cannot protect every person in his own home. We do not have the money or the manpower. We are losing the battle in the streets. Yet we must do something—something better than we have done in the past.

Let us start by getting at the REAL problem. Let us get at the CRIMINAL who brings and uses a gun when he commits a crime. Later we can address the problem of too many handguns possessed by too many citizens. That problem may alleviate itself if we solve the other problem first.

There is a difference between a person who buys a gun to protect his loved ones and someone who is out to commit a crime with an instrument of death.

Certainly, the bum who uses a gun should not be allowed to thumb his nose at society. Let us remove these potential killers from the scene. If a five-year term went into effect, they would go away to prison say on July 4, 1976, and know that they will not be out again until July 4, 1981. Maybe our good citizens, on our 200th anniversary will have a little freedom to pursue their happiness in these United States of America.

If these hoodlums are convicted a second time of using a gun in the commission of these crimes, the mandatory sentence should be doubled or tripled. The third time we should throw away the key.

Just recently, several state legislators have proposed a two-year mandatory sentence for the use of a gun in a felony. While I still would like to see a stiffer sentence (5 years) I definitely support their proposal. It would be good for Michigan to lead the nation with such enlightened legislation. We should congratulate their efforts.

The criminals, no doubt, will always be able to get a gun and of course the bullets for it, but if this legislation is passed, they will think twice before bringing a loaded gun with them when they go out to rob, burgle, and rape. The professional burglar of old would never have brought a gun with him. He had a certain pride in his craft. He wasn't a mean killer. Today, who do we have committing these crimes? About three-fourths are recidivists (repeaters), a small core who are committing the majority of the crimes over and over again. Half of all serious crimes are committed by kids. Far more than half are drug addicts who are hopped up. Most of all, these people use guns. A gun should not be in such hands—hands that represent people who could not care less, or are immature or are crazed, hopped up by drugs, and whose fingertips could snuff out the life of a citizen or policeman.

The smart criminal is one who is "jail smart." He wheels and deals through his lawyer, delaying and adjourning the trial, using and abusing our criminal justice system while the victim lies in the hospital or the morgue. Let's stop playing games. Or if we MUST play games, let's change some of the rules.

The calls for the return to capital punishment are many. However, if the gun-crime legislation is passed, there will not be so many killers to be capitally punished.

We the citizens must get smart now, so that we leave our children a better day 37 years from now.

I would be remiss, if I did not lend my voice in support of these good legislative proposals. Let's send out a strong message to the bums and punks and potential killers everywhere and put some fear into their hearts and save our good citizens and save our police. Do it now, here in Michigan.

I speak today for myself, but I believe that there is not a police chief or a sheriff in the country who would not agree that something

must be done about the use of guns while committing a crime. Let us leave a better legacy for the future. Let it start here in Michigan. Let us show that the law can work for society. Let us show that society can work the law. Let us leave the gun carrying burglar, robber and rapist to his "peers." Let him know that if he "does the crime," he'll "do the time."

THE OTHER 20 PERCENT: POVERTY IN THE SOUTH

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Regional Council recently published a study by Gretchen MacLachlan entitled "The Other Twenty Percent: A Statistical Analysis of Poverty in the South."

The findings, as noted in an introduction by the council's executive director, George Esser, and associate director Harry Bowie, include these:

Inflation in the South has grown at a higher rate than in the Nation as a whole.

Work is no guarantee against poverty. The majority of southern poor people work.

The industrial structure of the South is more heavily concentrated in low-wage industries than in the rest of the Nation.

Poverty is more intense among southern blacks than among whites.

Southerners have received less formal education than the Nation's population as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, these and other findings in the study—which can be obtained from the Southern Regional Council, 52 Fairlie St. N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30303—underscore the need for action on a national as well as regional and local level to improve economic conditions in the South. A more prosperous South will relieve extreme suffering in that area and benefit the entire national economy.

I submit for the RECORD the statement by Mr. Esser and Mr. Bowie.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE ESSER AND
HARRY BOWIE

In a time of economic recession and inflation the persistence of poverty in the South takes on special significance. Inflation in the South, for instance, has grown at a higher rate than in the nation as a whole. Moreover, the method of computing those in poverty fails to take into account an extremely important factor. Items in family budgets which had the most rapid price increase—food, housing, transportation—constitute a far greater share of poor people's expenditures than of those in middle income groups. Poverty levels established in 1964-65 are updated each year to reflect changes in the cost of living by the increase in the total consumer price index. But beginning in 1972, accelerating in 1973 and 1974 the price increase in the items for which the poor spend their money has been greater than in the total index. What this means is that since 1972 the number of actual poor has been understated and that as inflation continues, especially in food prices, the number will continue to be understated.

This study, essentially a statistical analysis of regional poverty data derived from the 1970 Census, illustrates that well before the pres-

ent crisis in the nation's economy the South had a larger proportional share of the nation's poor than the remaining 39 states. It is also clear that a significantly large number of Southerners, not classified as poor, were living on incomes that put them perilously close to poverty levels.

The census of 1970, we would point out, represented the first time that the Census Bureau had collected poverty data on the scale reported here. Our purpose in presenting an examination of the regional data is to identify the South's poor in detail in order to provide a statistical base for remedial action. Several major findings, with broad policy implications, emerge from our analysis.

Poverty among Southern blacks, as has historically been the case, remains more intense than among whites, although in absolute numbers more whites are poor than blacks.

Poverty rates in rural areas, not unexpectedly, were uniformly higher than in urban areas.

The percentage of poor families headed by females was far greater than those headed by males. Black female headed families are particularly vulnerable. As a result, the South's poverty bears heavily on the children of the region, since most female-headed families—of both races—contain children.

Work is no guarantee against poverty. The majority of Southern poor, in fact, do work, but do not earn enough to raise their families' income above poverty levels.

The industrial structure of the South in 1970 was more heavily concentrated in low wage industries than was true in the rest of the nation.

Only a very small percentage of Southern families received public assistance in 1970. All states defined need at levels lower than the federally established poverty line. In most Southern states maximum payments were far below even the states' own established need levels. The result of such policies was inevitable: public assistance helped only a small fraction of the poor to move out of poverty.

Although overall the rate of participation in Social Security by the South's elderly was only slightly below that of the elderly in the rest of the nation, participation among elderly blacks was far below national averages. This was so because elderly blacks during their work years were heavily concentrated in domestic work and farm labor, jobs that only during the past two decades have come under the Social Security Act.

Southerners have received less formal education than the nation's population as a whole. Among the poor the percentage with a high school education is still alarmingly low.

Detailed policy recommendations to reach the causes of regional poverty are beyond the scope of the present study, but the need for certain broad measures is clear.

Public education in the South should provide for equitable financing of schools in order to bring a higher quality of education to children in poverty areas.

There must be adequate funds for manpower programs that will enhance individual earning opportunities, improve productivity and contribute to economic development. Such programs should not only meet labor market demands, but provide special assistance to persons living in rural areas and in urban ghettos, to women, to youth, to minorities who have for so long borne the penalties of employment discrimination. These programs should be linked with governmental economic development policies that will influence the location of jobs in poverty-heavy areas.

Social welfare programs should be focused toward bringing both the working poor and those not in the labor force to at least a minimum needs level, preferably to be determined by the federal government, on a uniform basis rather than by states. Existing

programs should be strengthened, outreach efforts undertaken to enroll those eligible. For, almost by definition, the poor among us are those who benefit inadequately and inequitably from the normal workings of the economic and social order.

There remains the danger, however, in a period of national economic crisis that the problems of those at the very bottom of the economic ladder will be exacerbated. Programs designed to aid the poor have never been popular among the affluent, and today there are voices in the land calling for drastic cutbacks in social welfare programs as a panacea for halting inflation. We do not pretend to have the solution to the nation's current economic perplexities. But we do not believe that in a compassionate nation, at a time when more people—not fewer—will likely need the services of such programs that acceptable answers are to be found in penalizing those most victimized by, and least responsible for, the hard times that now beset us all.

Nor, finally, will the best interests of society be served by penalties that prevent those same people from finding a productive role. Back of each statistic in our report are flesh and blood people, adults who have never known any existence other than that of harsh, and shattering poverty, children whose childhoods are being needlessly blighted and whose potential for growth into useful citizens is being jeopardized, the elderly who are victims of their own failing strength and of society's indifference. Seen in such a light the statistics here take on a new and terrifying reality.

We present our data, then, with the hope that policymakers at every level of government and in the private sector will use it as the basis for formulation of policies and programs that both respond to basic human needs and open up opportunities for a full share in a productive society.

GAS RATIONING? NO THANKS!

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has voted to block the President's proposal to raise oil import taxes, the burden is the opponents' to propose ways to reduce oil consumption.

At least one major newspaper, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, applauded the President's bold initiatives, and in its January 26 editorial called on us not to forget the sad experience the Nation had with gasoline rationing during the last World War. I urge my colleagues to read carefully the Times-Picayune editorial, "Gas Rationing? No thanks!"

GAS RATIONING? NO THANKS!

Those, including congressmen, who believe gasoline rationing to be the way of our energy pinch have sketchy memories of the last time gas was rationed, or they haven't bothered to study that phase of history, or they weren't drivers then. They've even forgotten our recent sad experience with government controls.

Black markets, gross discrimination, politicians getting extra gas—to lay hands on extra gas tickets turned many an otherwise respected family man into a conniving wheeler in what became the great national pastime.

And if many average Americans turned a dishonest ticket, the underworld turned rationing into a vast gold mine. That was in wartime, too, and with more patriotic deterrents than in peacetime.

When President Ford favors oil tariffs and

excise taxes over rationing he is getting at the hub of our energy problem. This week he ordered his first tariff boost.

His program aims at cutting back on oil use, not only as motor fuel but in the whole array of other uses, including boiler fuel, heating and as a raw material for industry.

At the same time he proposes a lifting of the oil and gas price ceiling to spur the domestic search for oil and gas. So his plan calls for personal sacrifices in curtailing energy use and in paying more for energy. Rationing by itself would not stimulate exploration, but would act as a depressant, lacking built-in incentives.

The Ford plan calls for no new armies of bureaucrats with their huge budgets and endless red tape. Backers of rationing cannot make similar claims for their multi-billion-dollar idea.

Accompanying the vaguely outlined rationing idea is a plea for a 90-day delay. Another delay atop the near year and a half since the spigots were shut on oil of the Middle East? Where have congressional opponents of President Ford been, sunning in the Watergate floodlights?

Mr. Ford and his experts have hammered out a plan over the months, coming up with a considered program to help the energy-short nation work its way toward energy independence.

Those against the administration's recommendation are long on criticism, short on research and still groping. In their ranks are many of the same people who, a short while ago, harangued that Mr. Ford had no plan.

Negativism and obstructionism are no substitute for the constructive cooperation needed between Congress and the White House to work the nation out of the hole on energy.

Persons who present as painless any plan to make up for our years of neglect, misrule and profligacy in the field of energy brand themselves impostors."

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the 1974-75 New Jersey winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy Contest is a resident of the 11th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

The New Jersey winner is Frank A. Frederick, Jr., of Orange, N.J. Frank is a junior at Our Lady of the Valley High School in Orange. He is the son of Frank Sr. and Patricia Frederick.

I congratulate Frank Frederick upon his fine achievement and wish him the best in the nationwide contest to be held this month in Washington.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I insert the winning essay for New Jersey:

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM WINNER, FRANK A. FREDERICK, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

When it comes to the Pledge of Allegiance, how do you say it? Do you recite it as one long sentence? I remember years ago, I and my friends practiced saying it in one breath and whoever said it fastest won. I guess in a way we are all like that. We are so accustomed to saying the pledge that we forget its meaning:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands; one nation

under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This is my responsibility as a citizen of the United States, to see that the pledge is spoken with the heart, accepted by the mind, and made true by the body.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that, if a government becomes a tyranny, it is the responsibility of the people to see it overthrown.

Our government is a far cry from tyranny and was created flexible enough to remain sound if we guard it. Our government was designed so that all can have part ownership in it. But with ownership comes responsibility, the responsibility to see the laws of our making obeyed and the laws that have become unacceptable changed.

I believe in our government, and our laws, and in our right to peacefully change those laws that are, at least, obsolete. And I will stand and defend this country if it needs defense.

But, let me say this: I am not an American patriot, I hold patriotism to humanity. I value man higher than I do his government. If this means that I must disagree with the law-makers to better help those lawed upon, I shall.

That is my responsibility.

Though it seems unlikely, that is also the rule stated in the Pledge of Allegiance, that men have liberty and justice—all men.

As a citizen: I am a businessman, a merchant, a farmer, a laborer. I am married, widowed, divorced, and single. I am a woman, I am a man, I am a child, I am an adult.

I am myself, but I am part of everyone around. There are few that I do not effect by my actions.

I rule and I am ruled. I sin and I am sinned against. I feel joy and I cause joy.

I am a product of this country. My values and responses are shaped by this country. My duties and responsibilities I accept happily in the name of this country. And, for all its faults, I love, and am proud to be a member of, this country.

JOHN CURTIS SMITH CHOSEN INDIANA WINNER OF VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR SCRIPT OF "MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN"

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conducts the Voice of Democracy scholarship program in our Nation's secondary schools. This is a national broadcast scriptwriting program which provides our high school students an opportunity to write and speak up for freedom and democracy.

This year's theme is "My Responsibility as a Citizen," and I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that the winner from the State of Indiana is one of my constituents, Mr. Curt Smith, of Indianapolis.

Curt is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John R. Smith, of 8049 Chiltern Road, Indianapolis. Curt attends Pike High School in Indianapolis, where he is president of the senior class, editor-in-chief of the school paper, and a Student Council representative.

Curt will be coming to Washington next week for the final judging of all

State winners and I wish him the best of luck in this final competition.

I commend Curt's essay to the attention of my colleagues:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

Most of us take our citizenship for granted. By whatever means it was acquired, we still just take it for granted. To most Americans the important thing about citizenship is just having it. Few of us ever stop to think about or consider our responsibilities as a citizen.

By definition a citizen is a member of a political or social group. He gives his allegiance to the group and in return he receives its benefits. Citizenship involves the rights, privileges and duties of an individual. Most of us are aware, and very vocal about our rights and privileges. Few of us, however, stop to consider, let alone fulfill our duties.

The outcome of good citizenship and the by-product of the work of the good citizen are obvious and essential. Good citizenship yields a stronger better nation. The good citizen works to improve his country and there are many ways that I, as a good citizen, can do this. As a good citizen I should obviously abide by the laws of my country. I should pay my taxes to help support the government, and I should be respectful of others wishes. But my most important responsibility is to safeguard the rights and privileges of other citizens. I must protect everyone's rights. Using Nazi Germany as an example the importance of this can be illustrated for all of us. As the rights of certain religious groups eroded under Hitler's rule, the other citizens did nothing to protect or secure the rights for the oppressed. This started the irreversible tide, and eventually the entire country was a totalitarian state with Hitler and his men having all the rights and the true citizens none.

It is proven that in order for people to be strong and free-thinking they must be free. This prevalent atmosphere in America is necessary and essential to her citizens. Without strong citizens our country will falter. Therefore, my primary responsibility, or duty, lies then in protecting the rights and privileges of the other citizens of my country.

One of the more basic concepts of American government is that the government and the people who compose it reflect the people. Therefore in protecting and preserving these rights I serve a multiple purpose. I help make the government strong and productive, I help make her citizens strong, while securing the blessings of liberty and security for myself.

Now that I know the primary responsibility of a citizen I need to know how I can go about carrying it out. In preserving these rights and privileges I must vote responsibly. Voting responsibility entails more than just pulling the right lever on election day. It means being informed of the true issues. It involves being a student of your government. As a good citizen I should involve myself. As a good citizen I should develop a nationalistic attitude. This attitude encompasses many things. I must learn to submit to the will of the masses when I have a different opinion. I must also work to secure the rights of the minority when I am in the majority. I must learn to question and at the same time submit to national policy. All this time I must remember: "The government that governs best governs least." This saying is well proven in America. And this brings me to my final responsibility as a citizen. I must govern myself. I must act as a responsible person so it won't be necessary for others to govern me. The greatest asset of the citizens of America is their government and nation. And the greatest asset of America is her citizens. That relationship is vital and essential to both.

An oath from the ancient Greek city of

Athens embodies many of the responsibilities of citizenship and eloquently states my responsibility as an American citizen: "We will never bring disgrace to this, our city, by any act of dishonesty or cowardice, nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks. We will fight for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many."

This then becomes my responsibility: To stand for the best in America, shun the dishonesty, deplore the cowardice and remain constant to the ideals of the American way.

THE NEED FOR GUN CONTROL AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL TO CONTROL HANDGUNS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to us all that the 94th Congress will simply have to assume a responsibility for passing effective handgun control legislation. The situation is out of hand, as the FBI has reported since 1972, some 31 percent of all murders occurred within families and between others close to each other. Another 41 percent grew from disputes which were, presumably, between persons who knew each other well.

Handgun ownership has proved to be one of the most destructive facets of our modern society. Witness the fact that for every thief confronted by a homeowner bearing a handgun, four homeowners or their relatives are killed in handgun accidents. Furthermore, only 2 percent of home robberies result in the trespasser being shot by the homeowner. Clearly the cost of public handgun ownership far outweighs the benefits.

An advertisement recently appeared in the Washington Post sponsored by the National Council to Control Handguns. What is most unsettling, perhaps, is the validity of the advertisements' reference to congressional inaction being responsible for a persistently high national crime rate. As reported by the National Commission on Civil Disorders, the Administration of Justice, and the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, our crime rate would decline significantly with the elimination of public handgun ownership.

I am hopeful that the advertisement which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time will serve as a reminder to each and every colleague in the House that handgun control legislation must be a high priority item for the 94th Congress:

IS IT NOT TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT?

Over a quarter of a million Americans were at this end of a handgun last year—victims of 10,000 murders, 100,000 serious assaults, and 160,000 armed robberies.

Since the 1930's a majority of Americans have supported handgun controls. By not enacting effective handgun legislation, past Congresses have not responded to the views of the electorate.

The National Council to Control Handguns, a new non-profit organization, needs your support to bring the urgent message from the people to the politicians—we are fed up living with crime. The 94th Congress should and can act to reduce crime in this country.

March 4, 1975

Congress must start by passing effective legislation to control the handgun—the favorite weapon of the criminal.

Won't you please join us in working for a more peaceful America?

(Because we are an active lobbying organization, gifts to NCCH are not tax deductible. Mark Borinsky, Chairman.)

Please make your check payable to:

NCCH (The National Council to Control Handguns)

1910 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

Enclosed is \$15 for NCCH Membership Dues — I wish to give more. Enclosed is — \$500 — \$100 — \$50 — \$25 \$-----

Name -----
Address -----
----- Zip -----

A WEEK CAN CHANGE ONE'S LIFE— IN COMMEMORATION OF OUR VIETNAM DELEGATION'S RETURN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our distinguished colleagues' return from their 7-day sojourn to Vietnam. They bravely set out to determine whether the premises that have guided our economic and military policy toward Vietnam—premises that have evolved over 20 years of dishonorable, unconscionable, and unethical involvement in a war we never chose to declare—have caused us to become too unflinching in our resolution to end this U.S. immersion in Vietnamese history.

I am sure we will all be interested in their comments and conclusions about their experiences, and in any suggestions they might have for a possible hesitation in our current perseverance to end all involvement immediately.

I will always listen to anyone's justifications for continuing an unjustifiable nourishment of an endless battle.

In commemoration of the return of this delegation, I wish to insert a New York Times article, written by Russell Baker, which will conclude my remarks:

CONGRESS IN DISNEYLAND

(By Russell Baker)

The Administration is trying to get a group of Congressmen to go to Vietnam and discover that American policy there is sound.

It is a routine that was developed in the early Johnson period. Whenever, as now, Congress threatens to balk at financing our various wars out there, the Administration transports a group of them to Vietnam to admire our policy successes on the scene and bring back a rosy report.

If the group ever gets off the ground, it won't see the Asian Vietnam, of course. Nobody very important has been allowed in there since 1967.

In that the Government realized that the whole thing might collapse at any moment, and naturally it did not want to lose a lot of Congressmen who had been sent there to see how splendidly the policy was succeeding.

The National Security Council decided it would be safer to demonstrate our Vietnam successes in a less troubled setting. It called in the creators of Disneyland and had them build a brand-new Vietnam on the outskirts of Rockville, Maryland.

This is where Congressmen signed on for Administration tours go when their plane leaves Washington. They fly to New York, spend two days in one of the Kennedy Airport holding patterns, and then land at Rockville where briefings begin immediately.

The man who plays President Thieu at the Rockville Vietnam is a retired actor named Slim Sensenbaugh, and I asked him recently what sort of policy successes he would show visiting Congressmen.

"It'll be a little different from the old days when we used to get Bob McNamara and Gen. Max Taylor up here in Rockville," Sensenbaugh explained. "In those days we gave them a simple rosy-outlook briefing. All they wanted was enough to be able to go back and say there was light at the end of the tunnel if we just had the patience to spend a few billion more dollars."

Nowadays the situation is different. There is no hope that Congress will send billions to Vietnam this year. Professor Kissinger will be happy if he can get just a few hundred millions.

"For this kind of thing," Sensenbaugh said, "we'll show them evidence that the other side is determined to humiliate the United States by crushing us, but that we can hang on if Congress will come across with a trifling three or four hundred million."

I asked to see some of the Rockville Vietnam's devices for persuading Congressmen, and Sensenbaugh took me to a large well-lit room full of writers.

"These writers are mostly old fiction writers from dead magazines—Collier's, The Saturday Evening Post, Life," Sensenbaugh said.

"Right now they are all busy composing captured enemy documents that will prove to Congressmen that the Communists believe the United States is too cheap to keep up the good fight."

He showed me a freshly inked captured enemy document. "Top Secret from Hanoi," it said. "Unless the Congress of the United States gives Professor Kissinger \$300 million right away, Communism will triumph by springtime."

A writer handed Sensenbaugh a draft and asked what he thought of it. It said, "Top Secret and eyes only to our brave captured soldiers—if Kissinger gets the \$300 million from Congress it's curtains for Communism in Asia."

"A little obvious for my taste," said Sensenbaugh, "but a Congressman should love it."

I asked Sensenbaugh if visiting Congressmen ever asked to see some captured enemies. "We always keep a large cast of captured enemy soldiers in case they do," he said, showing me a compound where a large cast was practicing looking captured and hostile.

"It's the chorus of the Metropolitan Opera," he said. "They always need the money."

Don't visiting Congressmen ever object to being sent to the Rockville Vietnam? The only man who ever objected, said Sensenbaugh, was George Romney. He came back from Rockville saying he had been "brainwashed" and everyone became so angry that Romney had to stop running for President. "He had broken the rules of the game," I suggested tentatively.

"It wasn't that," said Sensenbaugh. "Everybody saw Romney was a dangerous man when he admitted we brainwashed him here at Rockville. A guy like that could have gotten the whole country trapped in the quagmire of reality. What's more Congressmen might have had to start going to the real Vietnam again. We could lose a lot of Congressmen that way."

CHARLES SAYERS, WINNER OF VFW- SPONSORED "VOICE OF DEMOC- RACY" CONTEST IN NEW YORK

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. The excellence of this program in fostering good citizenship among our youth is known and recognized throughout the land by reason of this distinguished organization's tireless efforts and dedication to the service of the Nation and its young people. I am informed that this year nearly half a million secondary school students participated in the contest for scholarship prizes worth up to \$10,000, thanks to the generosity and good work of the VFW.

With such keen competition as this, it is an honor for me to announce to my colleagues in the House that the winning speech for the entire State of New York this year was delivered by a 17-year-old who resides in the First Congressional District which I am privileged to represent. Herewith is the text of that excellent and inspiring speech as delivered in statewide competition by young Mr. Charles Sayers, Centerach, Long Island, N.Y.:

1974-75 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM NEW YORK WINNER, CHARLES S. SAYERS

Today I feel that there is a need to inform the American people as to what my responsibilities as a citizen are. To some it may sound like I'm saying that I'm constantly being assaulted by a barrage of laws while trying to keep my head above a sea of governmental red tape. That, because of this feeling, I believe that my fate lies in the hands of some Congressman who knows how to pull the strings that make the wheels of government turn. But do you realize that as an American I have two basic responsibilities without which our government could not survive? To love America and to protect it with every faculty at my disposal.

Yea, I can just hear you saying it now, "What can this kid do? He's only one person." Well, if you love a child do you constantly ask what you can do for it? Do you say, "I'm only one person. I cannot possibly love this child enough!" Of course not, you strive boldly ahead with all the love and sincerity you can possibly muster.

My confidence lies in the knowledge that our country was formed by the boldness and love for freedom of a few insignificant men. Where would we be today if two hundred years ago on April eighteenth Paul Revere said, "I'm just a poor little silversmith! How can I warn the troops at Lexington that the British are coming? I mean, Ben Franklin can ride a horse." Or if George Washington said, "Are you crazy? If I stand at the front of the boat I'll either get shot or fall into the Delaware." No, these brave men took their idea of government very seriously.

Unfortunately, within that two hundred year period we have suffered such atrocities as World War I, World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. But each was marked by the purpose of protecting America. Men have died to protect this country. They were merely individuals but their presence was made known. They did not run. They did not have to question as to whether or not the war was right but merely, "If I don't go what will happen to America?" Be-

cause, ladies and gentlemen, if I don't protect America who in God's name will? Will the blood and sweat of my ancestors be blown into the winds of time to settle into oblivion, because I did not have the courage to defend it? If America is to be left unguarded, being attacked not only by other skeptical countries but by our own people, what will be left for my children?

Whenever I have doubts about the honesty and dedication of a certain public official I look at what he or she has done for the benefit of America before I condemn them. I do not ignore governmental policies just because I do not understand them. Believe me, I'm not saying America right or wrong. I'm saying, if it's wrong, I'll look at all sides of the issue rather than attack it. If it must be changed I will try to amend it. And if its life is threatened, I will die for it. America belongs to the people and it is my responsibility to see that it is not taken away from us.

FAIRNESS IN THE NUCLEAR ISSUE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, energy is the key to our Nation's economy. Without a sufficient supply of energy, American industry comes to a grinding halt and millions of workers are thrown out of work.

If the United States is to avert this crisis, we must begin now to develop and utilize new energy resources such as solar, nuclear, and geothermal energy. We cannot rely forever on our fossil fuel reserves.

Because our need for new energy resources is so great, I have been disturbed by the disproportionate amount of media coverage given to critics of the nuclear power industry. The media is paying far more attention to the detractors of nuclear power than to the supporters.

Dr. Leonard Reiffel, in his column appearing in the Ashland (Ohio) Times-Gazette, has criticized the lack of fairness. Reiffel writes:

This imbalance in treatment on this most critical issue is very dangerous. Since the man in the street is hardly a nuclear expert, nor for that matter are most congressmen, the influence of this imbalanced attention can be enormous. The results of the mistakes in judgment which could thus be fostered will be felt for decades.

It would be extremely unfortunate if such imbalanced treatment leads the United States to pull back unnecessarily from the development and utilization of nuclear power. The future well-being of our economy could be the price we pay.

Following is the text of the article from the February 12 edition of the Ashland Times-Gazette:

WANTS FAIRNESS IN NUCLEAR ISSUE

(By Dr. Leonard Reiffel)

As a part-time inhabitant of the world of mass media, I'm often puzzled at the way our communications system handles certain issues. I suppose I really wouldn't be.

Someone said long ago that bad news travels fast, but I am nevertheless distressed at the amount of attention a single expert, whether real or self-proclaimed, can get by declaring himself "against" some program or institution. On the other hand, similar experts, perhaps equally or even more emi-

nent, can declare themselves "for" a given project, and their position will be buried on the back page if it sees the light of day at all.

Without taking a stand for or against the matter involved, I would like to draw attention to a recent statement by 32 of the most eminent scientists in our nation. Included in this group are no fewer than 11 Nobel Prize winners. Taken as a group, they are certainly a formidable collection of experts—some with vested interests in the nuclear business, but many in a position to be quite dispassionate in their views.

These experts strongly favor nuclear power as a way to deal with our critical needs. They also emphasize the urgency of a vigorous coal resources development program. Nuclear power involves some risks, but they point out that these can and are being well controlled, contrary to the scare publicity given to some minor mistakes which were simply part of the learning period.

Most people in this country are not aware of this authoritative expression of support for nuclear energy. Certainly the media did not give it national headlines. Contract this inattention with what would have occurred if these same scientists had come out with equal firmness against nuclear energy. Three-inch headlines on every newspaper in the country would have announced that "Nobel Prize Winners Declare Nuclear Energy a Mistake" or words to that effect. These men would have been invited to participate in television talk shows. They would have been interviewed on national network newscasts. They would have been invited to speak on the lecture circuit throughout the country, and quoted endlessly by the opponents of nuclear power. Indeed, just this sort of thing happens when a single scientist, frequently with dubious credentials, makes some kind of a sweeping accusation about nuclear power.

The imbalance in treatment on this most critical issue is very dangerous. Since the man in the street is hardly a nuclear expert, nor for that matter are most congressmen, the influence of this imbalanced attention can be enormous. The results of the mistakes in judgment which could thus be fostered will be felt for decades.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACT OF 1975

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have joined my colleagues Mr. RAILSBACK and Mr. KASTENMEIER in introducing the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act of 1975. This bill is a part of the package of reforms in laws and congressional procedures which are needed to restore the American people's confidence in Government.

THE NATURE OF LOBBYING

A central feature of Democratic government is that it should be accessible to the people. The purpose of lobbying is that they should reach it with maximum impact and possibility of success.

Former Congressman Emanuel Celler, Democrat of New York, said:

Lobbying is the total of all communicated influences upon a legislator.

The difference between good and bad lobbying is not whether the objectives of persuasion are selfish or altruistic, liberal or conservative, pro-labor or pro-business, but solely and simply whether the message conveyed is intelligible, accurate, and informative or cryptic, deceptive and obscure.

Although the general public tends to

view with suspicion anyone classed as a lobbyist, Congressmen know the con-structure services they render. The public, I think, tends to think of the lobbyist as a man smoking a black cigar, lurking in the dark corridors of the Capitol, luring the Congressman to a party, engaging him in surreptitious conversations.

Actually, lobbyists serve an important, even indispensable function in the legislative process today. They are experts on their subjects and are capable of explaining complex issues in a clear, understandable fashion. They prepare briefs, memoranda, and legislative analyses, and draft legislation for Members of Congress and committees; as specialists, they can often provide information unavailable elsewhere. Lobbyists follow closely the progress of bills in which they are interested, and can often give Members valuable advice on options available to them. They keep in touch with the interests in a Member's district, and they keep the people back home informed of the actions of their Congressman.

Admittedly lobbyists usually present only one side of a question, but spokespersons for the various economic, commercial and other interests of this country are much needed.

The lobbying function is an important adjunct of citizens' constitutional right to freedom of speech. In a free society, citizens have the right to petition Congress for legislation, and opposing sides of a question that have the right to be heard. Lobbyists focus the attention of the Congress on many issues which require legislation.

The lobbyists' job in 1975 is far more complex than several decades ago. Gone are the days when a single contact with a single influential legislator would accomplish the lobbyist's purpose.

The lobbyist today recognizes the diffusion of power within the Congress and within the Federal Government. He knows that the influence of any one Congressman is limited. His interests take him beyond the legislative process to all agencies of policymaking.

The techniques of the lobbyist today are, first, to provide information. Second, to encourage effective letter writing campaigns. Third, to testify in the committees, and fourth to sponsor visits with the Congressmen in Washington and in his congressional district.

Many beneficial pieces of legislation have been enacted in part because of the pressures applied to Congress by lobbying groups. Lobbyists have contributed to the enactment of laws to protect our environment, insure safety standards in industry, regulate campaign spending, and protect workers' pensions, among others.

Nonetheless, the absence of effective legislation has permitted lobbyists to acquire too much power, and to operate in relative secrecy, shielded from the scrutiny of the American public.

Large and powerful lobbying groups can influence the Congress to pass legislation which meets the needs of only a small group, sometimes to the detriment of the general public.

Lobbyists have treated Members of Congress and their staffs to anything from free meals to trips and expensive

gifts. While small gifts may arouse no suspicion, that is certainly not the case with the more extravagant gifts. Whether or not this is the case, the public may suspect that their elected representative has allowed his vote to be bought.

Grassroots lobbying groups often use the technique of stirring up avalanches of mail from constituents on various issues. In the absence of disclosure laws, a Member of Congress does not know whether letters he receives are spontaneous expressions of constituents' views, or the work of an unseen pressure group.

EXISTING LEGISLATION IS INADEQUATE

The 1946 Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, which is still in effect, is outdated, unenforced, and ambiguous. It is a sham, and should be replaced.

In the 29-year history of the act, the Justice Department has brought charges only four times, and only one of these prosecutions resulted in conviction.

Large loopholes in the law allow many interests to avoid registering. The law requires registration only by person paid to lobby for someone else. They must report how much money they receive and from whom.

Groups or individuals who spend money out of their own funds to influence legislation are not covered unless they also collect or solicit money for that purpose.

Only those organizations whose self-defined "principal purpose" is lobbying must register as lobbyists. Many organizations with extensive lobbying operations have thus been exempt because they had other functions besides lobbying.

Lobbying efforts are not covered unless a lobbyist contacts a Member of Congress directly. Lobbyists who generate grassroots pressure on Congress are not covered.

Some lobbying organizations claim that their contracts with Congress are designed to inform, not influence, and do not constitute lobbying.

The law leaves it up to each group or lobbyist to determine for himself what portion of his total expenditures need be reported as spending on lobbying. Two very similarly constituted organizations may report vastly different percentages of their budget as lobbying expenditures, depending on their individual interpretation of the law. Some organizations which are merely more honest than others have unjustly received a reputation as big spenders.

The present law applies only to attempts to influence Congress, not administrative agencies or the executive branch, where much legislation is generated.

Enforcement provisions are weak. The Clerk of the House and the secretary of the Senate receive registrations and reports but cannot investigate reports or compel anyone to register. The Justice Department can prosecute violators but has no mandate to investigate reports.

In the 1970's Americans have become much more aware of the need for an open, honest, and responsive government. They will not tolerate a government which lies to them or conducts its business in secret. In recent months, the Congress has passed laws which I hope

will improve the public's confidence. We have enacted a new campaign spending law and a budget reform act to restore control of the budget to Congress. The recent rules changes in the House have done away with the seniority system and opened up almost all committee and conference committee sessions. The reforms cannot be complete without a strong lobbying control law.

THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACT OF 1975

I believe that the bill I have introduced today is such a bill. It would:

First. Strengthen the definition of lobbyist to include anyone who receives or spends \$250 or more for lobbying during any quarter, or \$500 or more during a total of 4 consecutive quarterly filing periods.

Second. Require lobbyists to register, stating on whose behalf they are working, on what financial terms, what aspect of the policymaking process they wish to influence, and with whom contact is to be made.

Third. Require a lobbyist working for a voluntary membership organization to state the number of members in that organization and the methods by which the members' decision to engage in lobbying is made.

Fourth. Require lobbyists to report the amount and source of their income and expenditures on lobbying and related activities—travel, research, mailings. Lobbyists would have to file quarterly reports identifying each Federal officer or employee whom they contacted, for whom the reporting lobbyist worked, and what decisions in the policymaking process the lobbyist sought to influence.

Fifth. Require Executive Branch employees in grades GS-15 and above to report all contacts with lobbyists;

Sixth. Require the Federal Elections Commission, which was created by the recent campaign reform legislation, to enforce the act and receive all reports.

Seventh. Grant the Commission civil proceeding and subpoena powers;

Eighth. Require the Commission to develop appropriate forms for filing reports; make the reports available for public inspection; compile and summarize information received; make investigations to ascertain compliance with the law; have each report by a lobbyist published in the Federal Register; and make recommendations for further legislation to the Congress.

Penalties for failure to comply with the law would be up to 2 years' imprisonment, or a \$5,000 fine, or both.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act expeditiously in passing this important piece of legislation.

CORRECTION OF VOTE ON RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2166, THE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1975

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27 lists

me as being absent for the vote on the rule for H.R. 2166, the Tax Reduction Act of 1975. I cannot understand the mistake. As the RECORD clearly shows, I was present and did vote on the previous motion which occurred immediately prior to the vote on the rule. I remained on the floor and was present for the vote on the rule. Unfortunately, and due possibly to some malfunction in the voting system, my vote was not recorded. At this time I wish to state for the record that I voted in favor of the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2166, the Tax Reduction Act of 1975.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. MAX S. BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest in which high school students from around the Nation compete for scholarships.

This year the Montana winner is a talented 17-year old junior who attends Hamilton High School, Michael Bugni. The Voice of Democracy Award is only the latest in a series of prize-winning speeches Mike has delivered.

I was so impressed by his speech that I decided to share it with my colleagues. I submit it for the RECORD:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Michael Bugni)

I remember a story, about a king, and this particular king happened to be the third one in less than a year. To be quite frank, he was terrified of losing his position. In fact, he was so overcome with the fear of dethronement that he called for a meeting of all the people in his kingdom, and upon this gathering, the king proclaimed that everyone within his domain was completely and totally free to do as he or she desired. There were to be no laws, no taxes and no responsibility to the government. At first, the people were overjoyed. For months they lived in peace and the kingdom prospered. But soon they discovered a need for better roads, more public buildings, a uniform code of laws and regulated enforcement for occasional disputes. The kingdom was unable to function without rule and without discipline. The people went to the king and demanded action, but he refused them, for fear he might offend someone. So the people formed their own government. They elected representatives, they passed and enforced laws, and they taxed the people. Once again, the kingdom prospered, but the poor king found himself alone, broke and totally powerless. If the citizens of a nation are to be given freedom and rights, they must also be given responsibilities to their government or that nation will never succeed.

I am a citizen of the United States of America. I have responsibilities to my government and unless I fulfill these obligations, my country will fall. We tend to take advantage of our rights and we neglect our duties. We forget how lucky we are to live in a country that provides so many freedoms for us to enjoy. We interpret our privileges to be our rights, we demand from the government, yet we return nothing. To be an American citizen and to have rights, is to have responsibility. To me, that's a small price to pay for freedom.

As a citizen of the United States, it is my responsibility to obey every law put forth by

our governmental systems. These laws may seem unfair at times, but we must realize that they originated from bodies elected by the people. We have the freedom to protest and the ability to change, therefore, we must comply with those regulations established by the majority.

It seems to me, that apathy is our number one enemy in fighting national crises. If we can't concern ourselves with our own problems, nobody else will. In a country filled with shortages, hunger and crime, it appears that no one cares enough to save, share or cooperate, even a little. It is our responsibility to stop being so wasteful, to help our fellow man and to comply with the requests of our government. We constantly complain of poor leadership, little justice and political corruption, yet only 38% of those eligible to vote turned up at the polls last November. The American vote is not only a right, but an obligation to our country and if we are to sustain a government of the people, by the people and for the people, we must elect our officials with all the people. It will soon be my responsibility, as it should be for every legal-aged citizen, to vote in each election with serious thought and concern.

We are a nation and thanks to our government, we can live in unity with freedom. To be united is to live with our neighbors and it is my responsibility as a citizen to show civility and respect for people, taking care not to infringe upon their rights as I employ mine. I must acknowledge the right of others to express their opinions and ideas, and most of all, I must work to do my part in obtaining and accomplishing the goals of this nation.

The people of the kingdom had no responsibility to their government, but we do, and it is up to us to fulfill these responsibilities if we ever hope to see this nation last. As the citizens of this democracy, we are the rulers and the ruled, the law-giving and the law abiding, the beginning and the end. The responsibilities of an American citizen may seem expensive, but the freedom of democracy is priceless.

EFFORTS TO RESTRICT PUBLIC INFORMATION DISREGARD RESPONSIBILITIES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This editorial was written by Mr. Aubrey Sherwood, editor of the De Smet News published in De Smet, S. Dak. This South Dakota weekly newspaper serves 2,000 people in Brookings, Beadle, Miner, Hamlin, Clark, and Kingsbury counties.

This editorial illustrates the desire of the American people to know the details of governmental expenditures and governmental meetings. Government must be open at all levels to public scrutiny.

The editorial follows:

EFFORTS TO RESTRICT PUBLIC INFORMATION DISREGARD RESPONSIBILITIES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

Actions of officials in their duties, even proposed laws at times conflict with practices long established and laws on the statutes. A state official in recent years instructed clerks of courts they should not release to the press a monthly list of births, this though they could continue to provide lists of deaths, marriages and divorces—this as a convenience though not as a duty.

His effort was to prevent lists of births from appearing in the newspapers, and further in this regard he told clerks, that while reporters and editors might see the records of all vital statistics it must be with the restriction against their publishing the names of births.

This assumed an authority not known to this editor: that any official could restrain an editor from publishing what was common knowledge in day by day reports from doctors or hospitals, and which appeared on records that are public.

With the clerk of courts of this county so admonished, The News has not had a monthly list of births published along with other vital statistics reports monthly, not wishing to have a contention over this rather mild suppression of report. After all, births are available week by week and a monthly compilation would be possible from them.

In the transfer of the keeping of birth records to the register of deeds it appears such a suppression is not asked, and the January Vital Statistics report included births.

Legislators apparently can disregard laws on the books, in proposing bills with restraints in them. One offered last week would restrain County Auditors from including reports of the warrants drawn on the county in welfare payments in making the official publications required for meetings of the County Boards. This is proposed though the laws require that all expenditures of public funds be recorded in the minutes of whatever board may make them. The County Auditor, as an elected official, is responsible for recording the minutes and publishing them in the official newspapers.

Peculiarly, the proposed suppression of such payments comes at a time when there is public and official concern over the large expenditures in various forms of welfare, before the wells run dry. Thus there is need for officials, the people in general and even any receiving welfare in any form, to know the expenditures and strive to correct any abuses that exist.

However, basic to our form of government is the requirement that the public—the people—be kept informed of official acts regarding public funds.

MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 15, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Wilkes-Barre will hold its 30th annual dinner and I will be present on that occasion. One of the highlights for this year's dinner will be the presentation of the society's Man of the Year award to Mr. Bob Patton, dean of sports editors in northeastern Pennsylvania. I congratulate the society on its excellent choice and I also congratulate Bob Patton, whom I have known for many years, for his outstanding career and contributions to our area of Pennsylvania. I would like to make as part of my remarks the column on Bob Patton that was written by Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, an historian from Pittston, Pa., which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader and Record on February 27, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BOB PATTON NAMED MAN OF YEAR BY FRIENDLY SONS FOR SERVICES

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Highlights of the 30th annual dinner of the the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Wilkes-Barre Saturday, March 15, in Gus Genetti's Hotel, will be the presentation of the society's most prestigious award, Man of the Year, to Robert "Bob" Patton, one of "Five Points" (East End) most notable sons and an illustrious member of the Fourth Estate.

Dean of sports editors in Northeastern Pennsylvania, Patton will round out 40 years of service with the Wilkes-Barre dailies in August of this year.

Coming in from Washington to pay tribute to Patton will be Columnist Jack Anderson, who has been writing material for this paper many years. Also being honored on the program will be John McKeown, another East End who served the society as president the last year. Gus Genetti, hotel manager, feels the program will attract one of the biggest turnouts in the hotel's history.

Selection committee of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick which tapped Patton for this distinguished honor was composed of Aloysius Teufel, chairman, and City Manager Bernard Gallagher, Mayor William Connolly of Harveys Lake, and Thomas V. McLaughlin, a prominent civic leader and Wilkes-Barre businessman, all past presidents of the society.

For a score of years, Patton has been active in all facets of the society's activities having served as president in 1968 and in prior assignments filled the office of vice president, committee chairman and advisor to most of the group's presidents. He assisted with the organization's public relations programs since he first joined the association and for the past several years has served as editor of "Erin Sun," the society's annual eight-page program.

Son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Robert Patton of Kidder St., Wilkes-Barre, Patton graduated from Coughlin High School in June, 1935, and matriculated at Bucknell Junior College.

During his high school days at Coughlin, Patton worked as an assistant to the Record sports editor covering a variety of high school athletic activities. During his college days he served as sports editor of "Beacon," the college newspaper.

Always a general sports enthusiast Patton played baseball and basketball in his younger days, but his specialty for more than three decades has been golf, and like many present day linksmen, he usually travels the fairways on board a motorized golf cart.

Over 40 years ago, Patton aided in the organization of the YMCA Rogers Memorial Basketball Tournament, which remains as one of the major amateur sports attractions in Northeastern Pennsylvania. He initiated the High School Baseball Tournament at Artillery Park, in 1946, and its still going strong.

Patton served as a director of Hollenback Golf Club for more than a quarter of a century during which time he organized and promoted the Dan Donnelly Golf Tournament there. This golf tournament is currently regarded as the largest attended one-day event of its kind in Luzerne County. When the board of directors at Hollenback was phased out, Patton was then named to the advisory board of Wilkes-Barre General Municipal Authority.

Bob Patton played a prominent role in promotions which aided the welfare of the boys at St. Michael's School in Hoban Heights. He was vice chairman of Wyoming Valley March of Dimes committee several years and was sponsor of the basketball and bowling attractions which raised large sums of money for this humanitarian endeavor. He also aided Tom Flynn and Bob Eckenrode with Knights of Columbus youth work.

When World War II commenced, Patton was among the thousands of regional young

men who answered this nation's call. He served in the U. S. Navy.

Elected in February, 1949, as a member of the board of directors of Eastern Baseball League Writers, Patton was also instrumental in the formation of Northeastern Pennsylvania Sports Writers Association in 1963 and later served several terms as its president.

A charter member of Wilkes-Barre Local, No. 120, American Newspaper Guild, Patton was unit chairman for a decade and chairman of various guild activities for many years until 1963, when he was elected to the first of six terms as treasurer of Middle Atlantic District Council, American Newspaper Guild. In March, 1968, Patton was the recipient of an award from Middle Atlantic Council at an Atlantic City session, in recognition of his accomplishments and devoted service to his fellow workers of this organization.

In November, 1964, Patton was guest of honor at a testimonial dinner conducted in his honor at King's Inn marking his 25th anniversary as sports editor of the Wilkes-Barre Record. During the post-prandial program at this dinner Joe Butler, sports editor of the Scranton Times, referred to his long time association and friendship with Patton and stated: "Patton is a respected and most cooperative colleague working the sports' beat."

Married to the former Eleanor McFadden of Kingston, the Pattons are parents of two children, William and Virginia. Family home is located at 15 Second Avenue, Kingston.

Pros, amateurs, sandlotters, high school, and college sportsmen and sports women and thousands upon thousands of plain old sports fans throughout Luzerne County, and beyond its borders too, are avid readers of "Patton's Patter." Though provocative at times, all readily agree he covers a wide scope of sports happenings in great detail—and gives everybody a fair shake.

I'll be in attendance to witness his receiving this well earned and fully justified award as "Man of the Year."

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the members of St. Stephen's Catholic Church, in my district, recently celebrated the 100th anniversary of the founding of their parish.

Located in the village of New Boston, St. Stephen's was organized to serve the early Catholic settlers of Polish, German, Irish, and French descent. The earliest masses were offered in a private home, but in 1874, the families scraped together \$700 to erect a small brick church.

A history of the parish was written by Margaret Adams, and published in the church bulletin. I would like to share with my colleagues this well-written history of St. Stephen's, and include it to be reprinted in the RECORD:

ST. STEPHEN'S PARISH CELEBRATES 100 YEARS, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1974

(By Margaret Adams)

St. Stephen's Parish, New Boston, Mich., joins the honored ranks of parishes in the Detroit Archdiocese to celebrate a 100th birthday.

St. Stephen's parishioners and pastor, Fr. Alexander J. Wyrwal, marked the centennial of founding with a special concelebrated Mass at 2:00 p.m. in the church Sunday, Oct. 20, 1974 followed by a buffet dinner and

reception. Bishop Arthur Krawczak was the chief concelebrant of the Mass of Thanksgiving.

A dinner-dance, also in celebration of the centennial, is being planned by the ushers on the 2nd Saturday after Easter come April 11, 1974 at the K of C Hall on Van Born in Wayne, Michigan.

St. Stephen's Parish was located in the village of New Boston in the northeastern part of Huron Twp., then on the F. and P.M. Railroad, to serve early settlers of French, German, Irish and Polish descent. The first Masses were offered by a Fr. Gillie in a private home, but by 1874 the families were able to accumulate the sum of \$700 to build a small brick church.

Since there was no resident priest, priests from Dearborn came to minister to the community once a month.

In 1884, the first administrator, Fr. B. G. Soffers of Monroe took charge, and in 1887 the parish was placed under the charge of St. Bonaventure's Monastery in Detroit.

Succeeding administrators were Fr. John Needham, who left in 1909; Fr. L. H. Soest, who remained until 1919, and Fr. C. J. Dillon, the last pastor from Whittaker, Mich., to care for the mission's needs.

In September, 1920, Bishop Michael Gallagher appointed the first resident pastor, Fr. Alphonse Nowogrodski, who remained as pastor for 27 years.

Fr. Nowogrodski directed his immediate attention to the building of a larger church and a rectory. He purchased the present ground which the parish occupies—297 feet by 465 feet of frontage at Huron River Dr. and Sibley Rd. The rectory was built in 1922.

In September, 1923, ground was broken for a new church, much of the work being completed by a building bee, with men of the parish as participants. The total cost of the building was approximately \$23,000.

With his own church in use, Fr. Nowogrodski then turned his attention to nearby Belleville, where an Episcopal church, was purchased and remodeled and re-named for St. Anthony. That became an independent parish in 1946.

Worn-out by his labors, Fr. Nowogrodski died Dec. 14, 1947. An interim pastor, Fr. Peter Wyrzykowski had been named, but he had also died of a heart ailment.

Fr. Edward Miotke succeeded Fr. Nowogrodski and was installed in solemn ceremonies at the parish Dec. 19, 1947. At the time there was a sketchy religious education program, and Fr. Miotke arranged to have two Felician Sisters come to the parish each Saturday morning to give catechetical instruction.

Plans for a parish school were drawn up in 1949, and one year later, May 28, 1950, a groundbreaking ceremony was held. During the course of the building program, Fr. Miotke was transferred to a Detroit parish, and Fr. Ignatius Czapski was named the new pastor.

Fr. Czapski plunged into the building program with enthusiasm. The school was due for completion in September, 1951, but was not completed until October, when four Felician Sisters greeted the first classes of 176 children.

In May, 1959, the parish had lost another pastor with the death of Fr. Czapski, and Fr. Ladislaus Golas became the fourth resident pastor. During Fr. Golas' pastorate parish enrollment began a rapid increase, and the four-classroom was no longer adequate to hold the students wishing to attend.

The problem was presented to the Archdiocese and to a new parish school board for study. In the meantime, the present pastor, Fr. Alexander J. Wyrwal, was appointed the new pastor, arriving Jan. 18, 1967. The school problem was set aside temporarily as the parish had new issues to face—the church, convent and rectory were refurbished and redecorated—with the sanctuary of the church modified to allow the priest to say Mass facing the people. In October, 1967, a

parish synod was organized, and parishioners took part up to the Archdiocesan level.

Portable classrooms were leased for the school until July 8, 1967 when permission was granted St. Stephen's to add four more classrooms to the existing four of the school. The groundbreaking was held July 21, 1968, and the building completed so all children could be housed under one roof on Jan. 31, 1969.

AN APPROACH TO THE HOUSING CRISIS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are from the urban communities across this Nation are quite cognizant of the despicable housing conditions that many citizens are forced to deal with on a daily basis. As a majority in the Nation turn their attention to developing the communities surrounding the urban centers, those remaining in these neglected areas are forgotten, either by choice or design.

In January of this year the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 took effect. This law focuses attention and possibly relief on the housing problem. Shirley Better, president of the Los Angeles Board of Building and Safety Commissioners, recently wrote an article in the December issue of the Black Scholar dealing with the housing issue. She provides a very lucid analysis of the urban housing issues and offers some very plausible suggestions as to how we here in Congress might better deal with the issue. I ask you to carefully study the article which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

THE URBAN HOUSING CRISIS: OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE

(By Shirley Better)

Being the first black (and incidentally the first woman) to sit on the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners for the City of Los Angeles, I have become acutely aware of the complexities of the housing crisis and the way that municipal codes and federal programs have contributed to the deterioration of the physical structure of the inner city. There are no easy answers to the housing problem. Purported comprehensive approaches to revitalizing the black communities, e.g., Model Cities and Urban Renewal, are in reality a perpetuation of racism, and have only compounded the existing problem. What strikes me as most ironic is that before I was appointed to the Commission I didn't know it existed! How many other black professionals and inner city dwellers are ignorant of the power of municipal government in making policy which affects their basic human need, in this instance, shelter.

Let us examine this commodity, shelter, as it relates to the black communities across the country. One postulate must be the basis for all consideration of housing: inner cities have been gradually deteriorating since blacks began flocking into the cities (from 1914-1918). Minority groups historically have settled throughout the 20th century in the older neighborhoods of the cities, generally close to commercial and/or industrial areas where access to unskilled or semi-skilled jobs was easier. Ghettos were reinforced by restrictive covenants or brute force, and impacted by the inability of ghetto-dwellers to earn enough income to move into better neighborhoods.

Even when the black family become somewhat affluent, movement was restricted by racist housing patterns. Coupled with the influx of southern immigrants after World War II and relatively high birthrates, the black communities increased in population without substantial acquisition of land mass to accommodate the increase—hence overcrowding. The effects of overcrowding on structural environment of the inner city are manifest—inadequate open space areas for leisure time, inadequate living quarters, lowering of healthy environment with the increase of susceptibility to disease, and most importantly degradation of the human spirit.

Through the Housing Act of 1937, which provided for adequate shelter for low-income families, we view another component adding to the deterioration of physical conditions in the black community. Federal funds were used to purchase the land and finance the design and construction, and municipal housing authorities were responsible for the management and maintenance. These housing projects were constructed in urban areas where large concentrations of low-income families resided. An apt description of these projects was coined by William Moore, Jr., "Vertical Ghetto." The author elaborated on the condition by stating, "When thousands of people moved into these buildings, which in most cases comprised only a few square blocks, the public soon discovered that high rise housing projects developed characteristics distinctly different from those of other types of housing. These projects evolved into multistoried reservations with all the ethnic insularity and symptoms of an inner-city ghetto." The very nature of housing projects has led to their ill repute and the growing awareness that confining low-income families into a proscribed area over which they have little control and commitment will not solve the low-income problem.

On the other hand, the substandard condition of privately-owned rental housing has been so notorious that various jurisdictions over many years have made a variety of unsuccessful attempts to curb their excesses. Ironically, cities are subsidizing poor housing at the same time they are attempting to uproot it. By assessing improved property more on the worth of the structures than on the value of the lands themselves, they penalize those who maintain their housing units while rewarding those who let them run down and further subdivide them into slum tenements. Since the urban areas that blacks historically moved to were already older sections, we are discussing areas where residential dwellings are from 30 to 50 years old.

Since 1954 construction of new low cost housing has been far short of the needs in the inner cities. Due to the present paradox of recession and inflation, the Building Industry is facing huge lay-offs and the construction of new homes has come to a virtual standstill. The President of the National Building Industry Association estimates that nearly 60% of the potential home owners at this time cannot afford to buy a new home because of the tight money market. Conversely, blue collar workers with more modest means have found that the high cost of material and land plus stiff building requirements have put purchase of a private home completely outside of their reach if they are not subsidized by a government agency. So what the black inner city dweller has to select is varying degrees of aged structures.

Aged housing is not the problem alone—it is substandard, deteriorating housing coupled with this which is the crux of the dilemma. The 1970 U.S. Census Report cited that more than 30% of all blacks living in central cities reside in substandard, deteriorating units and units with serious viola-

tions.² Nothing has essentially changed except that probably the figure is somewhat higher now.

As if aged substandard structures, overcrowded living conditions, unsavory housing projects, and lack of new low-cost dwellings were not enough to uniquely identify the inner cities, we must add the dismal results of total frustration by black Americans with their living conditions by the incendiary destruction of their squalid prisons. It would seem in retrospect, that these communities were punished for their insolence by the over-long allowance of the maintenance of burned-out dwellings and brick-laden vacant lots. We still observe in the inner cities boarded-up buildings and gaping, eerie vacant lots as reminders of the black rebellion in the 1960's to improve conditions.

Another factor to be considered when examining the present state of housing in the inner cities is the unique condition of universities such as Columbia University in Harlem, University of Southern California in Los Angeles, and Temple University in Philadelphia, all situated in the heart of the black community and gobbling up the land surrounding them, forcing black residents out.

The policy of city governments regarding ghetto housing has varied. Historically, it has been containment—keep the blacks in a proscribed area, and support exploitation by absentee landlords through laws that reward rather than punish those who maintained substandard housing.

In recent years cities have had to make greater efforts to improve housing, mainly because the black population was engulfing the urban areas and was increasingly able to use its newly acquired voting power to elect city officials. The nation and specifically the cities have used variations of two solutions to cope with urban blight—rehabilitation of existing buildings and demolition of structures. Either can be done by the manipulation of building codes. The second solution, slum clearance, has proven not only too expensive, but, paradoxically, impossible to obtain. For, as one area is cleared, blight accelerates in the adjoining neighborhoods due to overcrowding and the ever-constant factor that all neighborhoods are growing older and therefore demolition can never keep ahead of age. Most blacks have come to the conclusion long ago that there must be another way to cope with this metropolitan malignancy other than whacking it out after it sets in.

The other alternative, rehabilitation of neighborhoods in the black community, is the area that suggests closer scrutiny as it relates to municipal codes and federal programs. Quality housing vs. low-cost housing has been the dilemma in municipalities. In 1954, the Federal government through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), enacted laws requiring that every major city initiate a program to arrest housing blight and deterioration—The Workable Program for Community Improvement. A Workable Program, although it carries no direct federal aid in itself, is a prerequisite for federal funding in the following categories: (1) Loans and grants for clearing, redeveloping and rehabilitating slums and blighted areas, (2) Grants for concentrated housing code enforcement programs and projects for the demolition of unsafe dilapidated buildings, (3) Section 220 Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for housing construction or improvement in urban renewal areas, (4) Section 221 d-3 FHA mortgage insurance to provide rental housing for families of low and moderate income and those displaced by governmental action, (5) Loans and grants

to provide housing for families unable to afford standard private housing.

It can be seen, therefore, that comprehensive federally-sponsored urban development plans are tied to the city's ability to operate the Workable Program. Let us then examine what a municipal Workable Program entails.

Operating under federal guidelines, the Workable Program aims at preventing slums and blighted areas through insuring that every dwelling unit meets reasonable minimum standards of repair, stability and safety. Housing specialists, designated by the city, conduct a systematic community survey, area by area, visiting each dwelling unit. The purpose of the inspection is to discover deficiencies or hazards such as structural damage, faulty electrical installation, defective water heaters and piping, unvented room heaters, inadequately framed additions, deteriorated exterior surfaces which are not weatherproofed or protected against decay by paint or other finishes, and leaking roofs. Notice is also given to other items on the properties including fences, abandoned cars and the yards. After completion of the inspection, where necessary a written report is given to the owner outlining in detail what corrections should be made.

It's a mammoth undertaking. For example, the Conservation Survey for Los Angeles takes fifteen years to sweep the entire city. The schedule calls for the Building and Safety Department to inspect a minimum of 40,000 dwelling units per year during the first ten years and a minimum of 120,000 per year during the final five years of the program.

A perfunctory evaluation of a city's Workable Program would be immediately embraced by blacks who would see this as the answer to revitalization of their community without having to level slum areas and build anew with the accompanying social problems that process entails. Cities have the legal arm through their municipal building codes to cite and prosecute anyone who is in violation of such codes—codes which establish minimum standards of health and safety in dwelling units. The average citizen is generally unaware of the far-reaching power of a city's Building and Safety Department. In some cities as much as 50% of the municipal code enforcement is under the direct administration of such a department—from awarding demolition contracts on vacant and vandalized buildings to approving architectural plans for new high-rise apartment buildings.

In fact, in middle-class communities, mostly privately owned dwellings, such a conservation program does work because the owners already have an incentive to maintain their property. Unfortunately, in lower-income neighborhoods, which are the larger portion of the black community, there are fewer privately-owned homes which are amenable to cosmetic repair.

Sitting on the Commission, I have gained much insight into this dilemma. In older communities, updating of building codes and rigid enforcement of existing codes can have almost the same effect as leveling a neighborhood. The cost to the owner of a tenement, for example, to bring the dwelling up to code requirements can seem so costly that he will decide that it isn't worth it and have the building vacated; later either he or the city will demolish it as substandard. On the other hand, the owner can make the necessary repairs; however, the cost of building materials and labor have skyrocketed. Even the well-meaning absentee landlord may find that he has to increase the rent to cover the cost.

In any case, the axiom in America seems to be to pass the cost on to the consumer. The effect of such improvements on the low-income renter is to force him to either shell out more of his meager income for rent in a now minimally safe apartment or move to another dwelling with lower rent but in substandard or deteriorating condition. What happened too often in the black community

¹ William Moore, Jr., *The Vertical Ghetto*, Random House, New York, 1969.

² U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Housing: 1970 Metropolitan Housing Characteristics*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1972.

is that the absentee landlord has failed to maintain property on any on-going basis, trying to get as much money as he could out of it. Further, the present tax system makes it more profitable to use the declining building as a tax shelter rather than spend money on repair. In other instances, it is of no benefit to the owner to upgrade the building as the rent for the low-income dweller is supplemented by a governmental agency with rigid control on rent hikes. Consequently, poor blacks are caught in the squeeze of what would appear to be a well-structured program to maintain the urban areas.

Let me hasten to add, however, that the Workable Program can be seen as a preventive measure to arrest the spread of blight if operated in the periphery of the poorest communities. If used inside the same communities, it could lead to a massive demolition program. For example, the Building and Safety Department of Los Angeles estimates that there are 24,000 hazardous old buildings in the city; this represents 35,000 businesses and 50,000 families. It is estimated that at the least 50% of substandard housing is tenant-rented. The Department estimates that 8.5 billion dollars would be required just to bring these buildings up to standards to meet earthquake requirements. Remember, Los Angeles, by historical standards, would be considered a newer city. It is easy to see then the economic and social problem adherent in strict compliance with building codes.

There's the other side of the coin, the use of strict enforcement of building codes, not to upgrade or arrest the spread of blight, but to force people out! Let's examine the implications of this as it relates to black communities. Across the nation, in large metropolitan areas, we are observing that the inner cities, the sections closest to the downtown commercial districts, are becoming increasingly non-white and poor. Cities are aware that it would be inconvenient as well as too costly to abandon the centrally located area. The city has nowhere to go, especially in Northeastern areas of the United States; the availability of new land is almost nil. Poor minorities are positioned on what the cities view as valuable land—land which the poor are unable to support as their limited income does not provide the needed tax base to support city operation.

It is common knowledge that many cities are nearly bankrupt because middle-class white residents who can provide the needed tax base have fled to the suburbs. What is the solution for city officials? Find a method to lure the middle class back to the city. First, however, the land must be reclaimed—big tracts of land for sale to developers. Some city officials have done just this by underhanded use of rigid enforcement of building codes. Allegedly, Chicago, along with other cities, conducted surveys of large blocks of desirable land south of the "Loop". Owners were told to bring the buildings up to all code requirements or evacuate. Reportedly, some owners set fire to the buildings to reclaim some profit, as it was completely unrealistic to meet the rigid demands of the city. With this, fire and liability insurance rates went up or insurance policies were cancelled altogether. These increased costs, of course, effectively killed off the possibility of small developers handling the renovation.

In some instances, other city departments assisted in the demise of an area by refusing to sweep the streets, failing to collect the garbage on a regularly scheduled basis, and withdrawing adequate police protection. You have then an area which looks like it's been through the Blitz, thus, allowing the city to make the only logical decision—clear the land and award contracts to large developers to construct high-rise expensive apartments close to the downtown commercial area to be occupied by the white middle-class.

We have witnessed the same theme with variations occurring throughout the nation. One variation can be the corrupt city councilman who resists efforts by housing inspec-

tors to conduct a conservation survey with essentially the same long range results—eventual demise of the community.

In summary, we can come to the conclusion that present comprehensive urban development plans haven't done much to arrest deterioration and preserve the essence of community for poor urban blacks.

One might say that all is not lost since President Ford recently signed new legislation, The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which takes effect next January and focuses on the housing problem. Previous HUD categorical programs such as Urban Renewal, Model Cities, Open Space Land, Basic Water and Sewer Facilities and Neighborhood Facilities loans will be consolidated under a single bloc grant concept requiring no local matching funds and giving local officials greater flexibility in the use of funds for the same basic purposes. The stated objective of the program is the development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Most of the funds will be allocated on a formula based on population, housing, over-crowding and poverty (counted twice), for cities over 50,000 population and urban counties.

Jurisdictions are eligible for their share of the funds as long as they meet certain basic requirements. These are: submitting a three-year community development plan identifying the city's needs and outlining strategy for meeting them; submitting a plan that determines the housing needs of low-income residents and specifies annual goals for meeting these needs; making assurances of compliance with civil rights laws and of adequate citizen participation and making annual reports on what has been accomplished.

The new bill offers provisions which will provide important meaning to the black community: Section 235 program providing mortgage interest subsidies to home buyers and Section 236 program for subsidies to renters have been maintained. Section 8 authorizes HUD to pay the difference between what a low-income family can pay for rent and the actual fair market rental rate in the family's area. This program will cover thousands of low-income families who will not have to pay more than 15 or 25 percent of their income on rent. Further, the bill makes funds available to assist jurisdictions establish on-going comprehensive planning processes. This provision can be vital to the black community, for if used appropriately, it can effectively stop the crisis-oriented action of the past—leveling blighted areas after they have reached the point of no return. Long-range planning could occur which allows for rehabilitation and low-cost housing construction on a continuous basis to prevent blight from becoming a permanent feature.

The primary focus of the Housing and Community Act of 1974—the transferring of decision-making and responsibility for results back to the local level—can have the most profound meaning for the black community. In many urban areas, blacks are a sizeable voting block which forces local officials to be more sensitive to our wishes! With this new bill, we can effectively pressure city officials to act in our best interests. Finally, there can be subordination of the land-use cycle, and of contractual developers to local initiative control. There is the opportunity through this bill to improve housing conditions in the black community—there is also the challenge to black residents to make this come about.

I have discussed in a tentative manner the opportunities of this new legislation, for as with most blacks I view with suspicion new publicized proposals which are meant to help black people. I would like to offer some concrete suggestions to black residents to insure that the provisions are used to revitalize the black community—not destroy it.

First, the bill provides that satisfactory assurances prior to submission or application for the funds the jurisdiction has provided citizens with adequate information, held public hearings to obtain the citizen's views, and provided an adequate opportunity for citizens to participate in the development of the application. Black citizens must therefore insure this takes place by watch-dogging all deliberations and if necessary seeing that Washington holds up the funds if the planning does not project the best interests of the black community. Most municipalities are now establishing citizen committees—be sure that persons accountable to the black community have membership on this committee.

Second, more emphasis must be placed on rehabilitation of existing housing rather than concentration entirely on new housing. Black residents must insist that in areas on the periphery of the poorest communities have a conservation survey to arrest the blight in existing housing and upgrade the living standards there. This will also encourage the channeling of contract money to smaller minority contractors.

Third, in the poorest communities where rehabilitation of housing is still possible a re-examination of city building codes is indicated. Presently, many municipal building codes require specific building materials to be used when cheaper more accessible materials are just as adequate. Such arbitrary requirements needlessly inflate prices. This situation creates two handicaps: it increases the difficulty for small minority contractors to obtain materials from uncooperative sellers, and it deters even well-meaning landlords from upgrading their property on an on-going basis.

Fourth, black residents should insist that local governments set aside funds to create programs to train and counsel residents of government-owned or subsidized housing to take more responsibility for maintenance and management of their buildings. To encourage their involvement a tenant council should be organized for each project with stipends given to the elected members to attend monthly meetings. To insure that their involvement in decision-making isn't a facade, local governments should appoint at least two public housing residents to the city's commission on public housing.

It was discovered that the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was the biggest slum landlord in Los Angeles; I'm sure this condition exists in other cities. Municipalities have not pressured FHA to maintain their properties as much as they should. Fifth, black residents, when discovering that a run-down building is owned by FHA, must insist that the city apply the same building code enforcement as it would with private owner. Residents must pressure the city by filing housing violation forms for FHA housing as well as privately-owned housing.

Deteriorated, boarded-up buildings slated for demolition have been allowed to remain standing too long. This often has the effect of dampening the desire of neighbors to keep up their property. Many local governments award demolition contracts on an individual basis with the inherent time lag between the identification of the property and the act of demolition. This process needs to be streamlined. It could be possible by cities awarding demolition contracts on an annual basis.

Finally, then black residents, through their city councilman and community groups, should insist that the city building department examine this possibility.

There is much incentive now by federal and local officials as well as blacks to save the cities. Each has had to realize their vested interest in the process because of the value of the land which cannot be abandoned and the growing concentration and political astuteness of minorities in urban areas. The climate is now more positive than it has ever been for a mutually beneficial partnership.

RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. MICHAEL T. BLOUIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BLOUIN. Mr. Speaker, I enter today an essay, authored by a constituent of mine, entitled "My Responsibility as a Citizen." The essay has been chosen as the winning entry from the State of Iowa in the Veterans of Foreign Wars 1975 Voice of Democracy contest.

The essay's author is David Faldet, an 18-year-old student of Thomas Roberts High School in Decorah, Iowa. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Melbourne Faldet, of Decorah, the former president of his junior high school class, a member of the student council and the drama club, and a foreign exchange student to Norway in 1974.

I found David's essay to be a source of both encouragement and hope, as well as a timely reminder of the truths we can easily lose track of when we are confronted with so many pressing and discouraging problems and crises. The essay follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By David S. Faldet)

Among my favorite novels is a book called Jonathan Livingston Seagull by Richard Bach. It is the story of a young bird who leaves his flock in order to truly learn to fly; and in so doing is excommunicated because his friends have no desire to allow their dreary lives to be changed. Yet Jonathan does not lose faith in himself nor his friends and assures himself saying, "We can lift ourselves out of ignorance, we can find ourselves as creatures of excellence and intelligence and skill." I believe that this same faith in one's self and one's fellow man is written into our nation's Constitution, for it is such trust that places the responsibility for our government in the hands of every citizen. It is also the kind of confidence in spirit I would like to share as I ask myself, "What is my responsibility as a citizen?"

Immediately the question could be posed, "Why feel any responsibility to the American system?" All too often this question is neglected. For today, we are part of an America more affluent than ever before; and in this affluence we take much for granted. In doing so we fall prey to blind reactionism and momentary whims in public opinion. The actions and energies of people whose lives are unexamined are as transient as sand in swift water, swept along without cause or true course. A government made up of such individuals is little better than no government at all.

In examining my life I believe that I do have a responsibility to the American system. It is a system that has enough faith in me and my fellow citizens that we are free to lift ourselves out of turmoil rather than to be lifted. I value freedom and freedom must arise from one's own power. For if we do not have the power to win our freedom, we surely could not find the energy or the motivation to maintain it. As a citizen, I am free to choose whether or not I shall keep this freedom, and keeping it demands responsibility.

As an American citizen, the opportunity for lifting one's self to the goals one chooses is greater, perhaps, than anywhere else in the world. Granted, the country has its flaws, but we can meet the changes of time. For the majority of Americans are not hard pressed to solely meet the needs of daily survival. We are able to look past the present and on to the future. Our national

wealth grants us the power to devote a great portion of our energies to lifting ourselves and our nation to unimaginable heights of achievement.

Jonathan Livingston Seagull was excommunicated, but he learned wonderful flight none the less. He swallowed any malice and returned to his flock to share with them his discovery, that all might be bettered. So it has been with all men history now remembers as great. They discovered where moral strength lay and used it as a guide for their actions. Even if they were alone in an unwilling society, they summed up their own inner strength to explore the realm of new ideas on their own. Our founding fathers were such men as in every man who has lived or died for a cause he truly believed in. Because of each such individual, every man becomes just a little richer.

Today, as since man was born, we are confronted constantly by troubles. Ignorance is the natural state of every man; and from it, troubles will always spring. Yet we can lift ourselves out of ignorance, we can find ourselves as creatures of excellence and intelligence and skill. I believe in the American principle, for I have confidence in the good within myself and every man. What is my responsibility as an American citizen? It is to locate that good, to become sure of the places it is found, and like Jonathan Livingston Seagull, draw from this good like a spring of fresh water, letting it guide my actions towards the benefit of myself and my fellow man.

TREATMENT OF MIA'S SADDEST CHAPTER YET IN UNREAL WAR SAGA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Oak Cliff Tribune in Dallas, Tex., is a good reminder of the sad plight of those men listed as missing in action. Editorialist Ray Zaubert points out the uncertainty that the families of the MIA's live with daily. Mr. Zaubert also reminds us of the debt we owe these men and their families.

I hope each and every Member of Congress and the general public will carefully ponder the plight of our MIA's. The editorial follows:

TREATMENT OF MIA'S SADDEST CHAPTER YET IN UNREAL WAR SAGA

(By Ray Zaubert)

One of the greatest national tragedies of recent American history has been the inability of the federal government to ascertain the fate of the 1700 Vietnam combatants still declared missing in action.

When Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger negotiated a "peace with honor" after seven years of direct American involvement in Indochina, one of the conditions was exchange of information about those who died in enemy territory.

Practically nothing has been accomplished in the way of assimilating facts on the whereabouts of the American MIA's. Several of the men still carried as missing by the War Department were positively known to be in Communist captivity. Others were cellmates of prisoners who languished for months and years in the infamous Hanoi Hilton prison.

The north Vietnamese adamantly refuse to answer questions about our men who died in prison or who failed to survive war wounds from ground action or plane crashes.

Families of MIA's who have traveled to

Vietnam seeking additional information about their loved ones have been treated to brutal silence.

Spokesmen for the Vietcong, when asked for further details about specific prisoners known to have been alive in captivity at some point of the war, claim they can give no information as long as the Americans continue to abrogate the peace agreements.

Certainly the intelligent citizens of the free world must realize that the United States has not reneged on its commitments while the Communists have honored only those agreements which served a momentary tactical advantage.

Add the inscrutable Oriental mind to the narrow limits of Communist ideology and the American negotiators have faced a hopeless task of trying to implement the peace terms.

Still, instead of admitting the hopelessness of the situation and the lack of success in tracking down the bodies and the graves—or perhaps a few American servicemen still incarcerated, the military remains mute.

The Defense establishment has refused to allow families to copy material from files of MIA's which might be helpful in adjusting to the realization that their hopes are ephemeral. Yet, there is considerable duplicity in translating the words of military spokesmen compared to their deeds.

Perhaps the armed forces leadership hates to admit its ineptness in resolving the MIA problem. And Henry Kissinger is hardly the diplomat who would confess that he was badly outtraded in a major foreign policy negotiation.

America is supposed to be an open society. Many of the new liberal Congressmen would now like to clip the FBI wings and handcuff the CIA. They have abolished the Un-American Activities Committee already. However, when their "mellowing" Communist idols prove their almost inhuman callousness over and over and over again, they are so eager to forgive.

The President, the Congress, the Judiciary, the Defense Establishment and the Bureaucracy have a heavy debt to those who served honorably in that agonizing war. And a debt to those still missing.

The wives and children, mothers and fathers, sweethearts and neighbors of those who served and disappeared are entitled to a better explanation of what happened to their men.

This is a sad and sorry chapter of American history.

ECONOMICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have stressed that we must strike a reasonable balance between our economic necessities and our environmental desires. The harsh realities of recession, inflation, unemployment and an energy shortage have made the need to arrive at a reasonable balance all the more imperative.

Recently the scales have tilted heavily to the side of environmentalism. Cleaner air and water are certainly worthy goals. There must be some relationship, however, between the cost of environmental regulations and their benefit. Overzealous environmentalism could plunge our Nation into economic chaos.

An example of what I am talking about is the Environmental Protection Agency's auto emission standards. Automob-

bile fuel economy has already decreased 5 to 15 percent as a result of pollution control devices. The American Motors Corp. estimates that it would cost an extra \$275 per car and an 11-percent loss in gasoline mileage to come even close to meeting 1977 Federal emission standards. Can our Nation afford these price hikes during an economic crisis? Can we afford to increase fuel consumption at a time of energy shortages?

Another example is the attempt to eliminate lead in gasoline. Unleaded gasoline means that the United States will consume an extra one million barrels of oil a day. The extra cost to consumers will be billions of dollars. Is it wise to increase our gasoline needs so dramatically when our supplies are becoming short? Can consumers bear the additional cost? Are we even certain that lead from automotive exhaust poses a health hazard?

The use of coal also has been seriously reduced through restrictions of the Clean Air Act of 1970. This act and regulations based on it have decreased industrial use as well as forced up prices of the one resource that the United States has a 200 to 400 year supply—coal. Is it sensible for our Nation to do this?

The trend toward overzealous environmentalism has been criticized by Irving Kristol, Henry Luce professor of urban values at New York University. Mr. Kristol states:

There is now considerable evidence that the environmentalist movement has lost its self-control—or, to put it bluntly, is becoming an exercise in ideological fanaticism . . . In just about every aspect of American life, the environmentalists are imposing their regulations with all the indiscriminate enthusiasm of Carrie Nation swinging a baseball bat in a saloon. Common sense seems to have gone by the board, as has any notion that it is the responsibility of regulators and reformers to estimate the costs and benefits of their actions . . . Making the world safe for the environment is not the same thing as making the environment safe for our world.

It is time for everyone to pay more attention to the costs of environmentalism in relation to the benefits derived. Unless we strike a reasonable balance between our economic necessities and our environmental desires, the result could be economic disaster.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA DECLARATION ON LIBERATED EUROPE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Czechoslovakia yearns to be free. Despite Communist domination, and the infamous Russian invasion of 1968, with its concomitant repression of the few freedoms that the Czechoslovak people had managed to accumulate under a liberal, though Communist, government, the people of Czechoslovakia dare to desire liberty.

One manifestation of this desire was the formation of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, an organization of many

outstanding Czechoslovak leaders interested in keeping the spirit of that unfortunate people alive.

Dr. Jan Papanek, a member of the council, recently wrote some pertinent remarks on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe. His statements clearly reflect that the spirit of the Czechoslovak people lives on. Let us not let their cries to free men throughout the world go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Papanek's statement to my colleagues:

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA DECLARATION ON LIBERATED EUROPE

Thirty years ago, the three Great Allied Powers—the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States of America—agreed at Yalta on a Declaration on Liberated Europe. They pledged themselves "to concert during the temporary period of instability in the liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the Peoples of Europe liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany, and the people of the former Axis satellite States, to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." Referring to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, they assured the liberated peoples of Europe of restoration of their sovereign rights and self-government and of their assistance in the formation of "Interim Governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements." Most importantly, however, the three Great Allied Powers pledged these authorities and themselves "to the earliest establishment possible through free elections of Governments responsive to the will of the people."

Following a short interim after the liberation during which the Central and East European peoples struggled for the implementation of the principles of the Yalta Declaration, the Soviet Union and the local Communist parties associated with it deprived them of their rights and freedoms and subjected them to their own exclusive rule. Today, 30 years later, none of the Central and East European countries is governed by a government issued from free elections and responsive to the will of the people.

Nevertheless, for the peoples of Central and East Europe the principles of the Yalta Declaration have remained a goal to which they have never ceased to aspire. Their deeds in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia reminded the signatory powers time and again, and with more force than any words could, that they wished to govern themselves in accordance with the principles of the Yalta Declaration.

From the beginning, the violation by the Soviet Union of the Yalta Declaration has also been the source of tension and conflict between the signatory powers and of continuing distrust, suspicion, and fear throughout the world. All rapprochement between the West and the Soviet Union has always faltered on this original breach of the solemn Yalta pledge.

It is, therefore, of paramount importance that the Geneva Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should not forget the lesson of Yalta and that it should bring back to life and fruition the principles and pledges of the Declaration on Liberated Europe.

DEPRESSED ECONOMIC SITUATION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to

insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues a letter received from a constituent of mine last month outlining in some detail the dramatic impact of his own family's economic situation of the present energy and economic crisis in which we find ourselves.

It seems to me that unless we are continually reminded of the real human impact this disastrous situation is creating for millions and millions of Americans, our constituents, we will fail to have the kind of urgency I feel necessary to deal adequately and with sufficient speed with the situation before us.

The text of the letter follows:

MANCHESTER, MASS.,

January 17, 1975.

Rep. MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: I, like most of your other constituents, have reached the end of the line on the energy situation and the very flagrant and obvious inaction of our elected officials to do anything about rectifying a grossly inequitable pricing policy. The crowning blow was President Ford's State of the Union address two days ago.

The following points are just a few of the thousands I am sure you could get from any citizen and I offer them as my own observations:

1. As a recent purchaser of Texaco stock, I received their 9 months' financial report ending 9/30/74. These figures were compared to the corresponding period in 1973. In 1974 their production figures were practically the same while their sales and earnings doubled. Is this gouging or not?

2. At the present time regular gas can be purchased locally for .479 per gallon while home heating fuel, a far less refined product, is currently being sold for .409 per gallon. Never before has this margin been so narrow.

3. Comparing my usage of home heating fuel in the period of August-January of 1973-1974 to 1974-1975, I find that my family has used 14% less fuel oil while paying 15% more total for fuel consumed. At the height of the crisis last February the price of fuel oil was .324 and now when there seems to be plenty of fuel oil available, my price is .408.

4. Late last fall there was talk in Washington of some plan, that seemed to have fairly wide acceptance, which would stabilize and equalize oil prices both imported and domestic geographically throughout the country. I have heard little if nothing since then.

Mr. Harrington, I am concerned not only from my own family's requirement but also, working in industry, my concern is grave as to the ramifications on Northeastern industry and the far-reaching effects on an already depressed economic climate.

It is about time you and your colleagues started to think this situation out and come up with concrete fair proposals towards stabilizing and equalizing this serious problem, not only for the Northeastern populous but better for the satisfaction of the entire nation. If President Ford's proposal for an import tax on imported oil goes through, it might well seal the coffin for the New England states.

I can see no reason that the remedying of this situation should not be the top most priority for all of our elected officials. Your endeavors towards this end are appreciated.

Sincerely,

DAVID F. COE.